

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 7, 1987

The House met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY).

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Help us, O God, not to use our prayers for our own benefit so that we may appear righteous or to practice our faith for the admiration of others or to make a show of our piety. May our prayers be open and honest and natural, and in communication with You, O God, for You have promised that when we earnestly seek to speak with You, You will hear our prayers and bless us in the depths of our hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 134) providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for further expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on the Judiciary in the 1st session of the 100th Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 134

Resolved, That for further expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the certificate of the Chief Justice of the United States (dated March 17, 1987, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on the same date) that consideration of a certain impeachment may be warranted, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House not more than \$300,000 for the period beginning on April 1, 1987, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1988.

SEC. 2. Any of the amount specified in the first section may be used for expenses for procurement of consultant services under

section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary, signed by the Chairman of that Committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 4. Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GAYDOS

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. GAYDOS: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That for further expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to judicial impeachment, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House not more than \$300,000 for the period beginning on April 1, 1987, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1988.

SEC. 2. Any of the amount specified in the first section may be used for expenses for procurement of consultant services under section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary, signed by the Chairman of that Committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 4. Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. GAYDOS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM], the ranking minority member of the Accounts Subcommittee, for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume, with the understanding that any additional time I may yield will be subject to the specific limitation for debate purposes only.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute to House Resolution 134 authorizes \$300,000 to be provided to the Committee on the Judiciary for fur-

ther expenses of investigations and studies with respect to judicial impeachment for the period beginning on April 1, 1987, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 1988. By the terms of the amendment, the provided amount will be available to the Committee on the Judiciary only for studies and investigations respecting judicial impeachment. The provided amount should not be used for other purposes.

On April 1, 1987, the Subcommittee on Accounts held a hearing on this resolution and reviewed in detail the justification provided by Chairman RODINO. The resolution as submitted would have authorized funds for studies and investigations involving one specific impeachment matter pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. That pending matter is an inquiry into the question or whether Judge Alcee L. Hastings of the southern district of Florida has engaged in conduct which might constitute grounds for impeachment. Since available information indicated the possibility of a second impeachment inquiry involving another Federal judge, the subcommittee determined that \$300,000 should be sufficient to cover the expenses of all studies and investigations respecting judicial impeachment that could reasonably be foreseen to be necessary and possible for the remainder of the first session. Accordingly, the subcommittee unanimously adopted the amendment in the nature of a substitute, now pending before the House, to accomplish this purpose.

Regarding the inquiry on the Hastings matter pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, the funds provided by this amendment will enable that committee to use temporary staff to perform the duties associated with this pending inquiry. The committee proposes to obtain two counsels, one counsel-investigator, one investigator, and two clericals on a full-time basis to work exclusively on this matter. The chairman of the committee has argued strongly that it is not possible to assign regular staff to the inquiry for any appreciable amount of time without impairing the committee's heavy agenda of legislative and oversight activities. It should be noted that the Claiborne impeachment last year involved a criminal conviction, and, as a result, minimal investigative work by the Judiciary Committee. The Hastings matter, however, involves an acquittal and this situation will demand detailed legal research and investigatory activities, and there are no direct

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

precedents to guide this type of inquiry.

For example, both criminal proceedings and the disciplinary hearings turned, in large part, on circumstantial evidence and the credibility of witnesses. As a result, the committee will need to conduct independently both extensive interviews and hearings involving individuals with personal knowledge of information germane to the inquiry. Additionally, the committee will need to collect and independently analyze a large amount of documentary evidence and to prepare a substantial number of legal memoranda and other documents. The additional temporary staff is essential to the conduct of an in-depth and responsible investigation.

The amendment, also, provides sufficient funds for travel and witness expenses, the cost of leased equipment, telephone charges, and necessary supplies.

Finally, during the past 6 years, the Subcommittee on Accounts has generally not approved requests for supplemental funds. However, it has made an exception for requests from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in order that this committee may have sufficient funds to discharge the important institutional responsibilities assigned to it by the House rules and statutory law in an effective manner and on a timely basis. The same strong institutional concerns are present in the matter pending before the House. The Constitution in article I, section 2, provides that the House shall have the sole power of impeachment. In the House, impeachment of a sitting Federal judge is a matter of high privilege. Accordingly, special funds should be provided for impeachment inquiries in order that such inquiry may be conducted thoroughly, responsibly, and with reasonable diligence. The proper discharge of this constitutional duty requires no less.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and the resolution.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority on the Subcommittee on Accounts, I rise in support of this unanimous-consent request and the resolution.

It is an unusual situation; it is unusual in the way we got to this moment on the floor, rather than by a reservation to the unanimous-consent request.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], has explained the situation well and adequately. It is necessary that we expedite this matter because it will enable the Committee on the Judiciary to proceed quickly with a possible, if not probable, impeachment inquiry.

That committee has an enormous task before them because this situation differs from other kinds of im-

peachment inquiries. We do not want to stand in the way of that process, and so we must expedite the situation as it occurs today.

The Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration has reviewed this situation very carefully, hence the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

At that point, I can say that the minority has no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, as both the speakers have enunciated here, this is a very serious problem that has confronted the Committee on the Judiciary, and I am personally grateful and speak for the committee that you were able to bring it to the floor as quickly as possible.

It is an enormous task to accumulate all the requirements of an impeachment inquiry and to have delayed it any further would have jeopardized our ability to do so properly.

Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentleman.

□ 1210

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BADHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the fact and invite the attention of the last speaker to the fact that this was not an easy resolution to dislodge from the committee. The committee believes that for standing committees that have vast staffs there should be an obligation to take care of emergencies as well as routine business, and in the end the majority of the committee prevailed and this is the committee consensus bill to which no one objects.

Nevertheless I do not want to let anyone on the Committee on the Judiciary carry away the conclusion that this was an easy thing for us to do, and we will be monitoring the expenses of the committee as closely as possible.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H.R. 2) "An act to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transportation programs, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and passed by the House of Representatives on reconsideration of the same.

The message also announced that the said bill was passed, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 200. Joint Resolution to designate April 10, 1987, as "Education Day U.S.A."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 514. An act to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to establish an incentive bonus for the successful placement of certain employable dependent individuals, to add an enriched program option of employment and training for AFDC/SSI youth and to the summer youth employment and training program, and for other purposes;

S. 825. An act to amend and extend certain laws relating to housing, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution disapproving the certification by the President under section 481(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 1928a-1928e of title 22, United States Code, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President, appointed Mr. ROTH as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly during the 100th Congress.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resig-

nation as a member of the Committee on Government Operations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 2, 1987.

Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, H-204, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby formally resign from the Committee on Government Operations in order to assume the seat to which I have been appointed on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

I would appreciate your making this resignation a matter of record for the House.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. SKAGGS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROPOSED CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 318, PROVIDING FOR RESTORATION OF FEDERAL RECOGNITION TO CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES OF TEXAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 318) to provide for the restoration of Federal recognition to the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and the Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is some Member here from the appropriate committee on the bill. I am not certain I have a problem with the bill, but the process that we are using differs from the process in the last Congress, and I am concerned about why we are changing from a Suspension Calendar to a Consent Calendar on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the call of the Consent Calendar is suspended and will follow the 1-minute business of the House.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive 1-minute statements from the Members.

SUGAR RAY LEONARD'S VICTORY SUPERSEDES—AT LEAST MOMENTARILY—DISCUSSION OF BUDGET CONSIDERATION

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it was my intent today to rise to discuss in this 1 minute the alternative budgets that would be presented to the House later this week.

Other of my colleagues will follow me to discuss specific areas where we believe that the House committee's budget proposal is far superior to the budget presented by the President, which appears to be without significant sponsorship in this House and we therefore refer to it as brand X.

However, in the flow of history there are transcendent events which take precedence even over an issue as important as the annual budget. Such an event occurred last night and I believe it important that we stop to celebrate a great triumph of the human spirit and the human will.

Mr. Speaker, Prince Georges County, with all the world, is celebrating today the feat of our own Ray Leonard, who has shown again his championship style, heart, and talent.

For those of us who have followed Ray Leonard's career every step of the way, from before his Olympic victory in Montreal in 1976, through his victories over Duran and Hearn, and through his retirements, today we are as proud as we have ever been.

More than virtually any athlete alive today, Ray Leonard is a hometown hero—Prince Georges County's favorite son. Not only is he the best in his field of boxing, but he is in a class by himself as a person. That is why we are so proud today: We admire Ray for his boxing skill, and even more we admire his personal qualities of hard work, intelligence, integrity, dignity, quiet self-confidence, and commitment to family.

Mr. Speaker, there is a feeling that Ray Leonard has turned back time. The naysayers and the pundits have all said that he was too old and had been out of the ring too long to regain his skills. With great strategic thinking and athletic ability, he proved them wrong.

This morning we say congratulations to you Ray Leonard, and thank you for giving us the chance once again, as you have so many times, to feel such great pride in your achievements.

PENSION PORTABILITY ACT OF 1987

(Mr. JEFFORDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today, on behalf of myself and several of my colleagues, I am introducing legislation concerning an idea whose time absolutely has come, pension portability.

Pension portability basically means the ability to preserve investment in a private retirement plan. A portability system allows employees to remain vested in a retirement plan even if they move from job to job. In addition this bill gives employers—particularly small businesses—access to affordable

plans they can offer their workers, without the redtape that has hindered them from offering these benefits before.

The concept of pension portability is not new. It was at the heart of a "Retirement USA" bill I offered in the last Congress, and it has been central to most pension reform debate for some time.

The problem is, we can no longer afford to debate the idea. The greying of our baby boom work force and the burdens increasingly being placed on Social Security make pension portability and reform a must now. Roughly half of our nonfarm workers currently have no private pension coverage at all, largely because costs and cumbersome procedures prohibit employers from offering coverage. If this situation is not corrected, we will be facing a major retirement crisis very, very soon.

The Pension Portability Act introduced today specifically addresses these problems, and I would urge my colleagues to study and support it.

ELIMINATE THE SOCIAL SECURITY "NOTCH"

(Mr. CLARKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with 123 Members of Congress in addressing a very important issue to Older Americans—the Social Security "notch." The bill introduced April 2 by Congressman ROYBAL, H.R. 1917, is a good alternative to the notch legislation introduced in the 99th Congress. This bill offers a fair way to remedy the unfairness created by the 1977 Social Security legislation.

This problem began in 1972 when benefit adjustments were made for cost-of-living increases. In 1977 further adjustments were made to remedy the overindexing of benefits which resulted in overpayments. However, Congress never intended the 1977 amendments to result in such severe reductions as those suffered by persons born between 1917 and 1921.

The Roybal bill remedies the notch problem through a 10-year phase in to the current benefit formula. Retirees born between 1917 and 1924 will receive higher benefits than under present law. The new benefits for this group will eventually merge at the current level for retirees born after 1924.

The Social Security surplus now building up can cover the cost of this phase in program. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this legislation which will remedy unfairness and provide needed help to some 8 million older Americans.

WARRANTED SANCTIONS IMPOSED ON JAPANESE IMPORTS

(Mr. SCHULZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, with this morning's headlines which state that the Prime Minister of Japan will ask the administration to cancel the sanctions scheduled to take effect next week, I rise today to commend the administration's action on March 27 to impose sanctions against the Japanese due to their violation of the semiconductor trade agreement. It's about time we demonstrate that we will take retaliatory action when clearly warranted. We negotiated in good faith with Japan and concluded an agreement to end the dumping of Japanese semiconductors worldwide and gain improved market access in Japan for United States semiconductors. The Japanese, however, have failed to honor their commitments.

Our patience with the Japanese is wearing thin and this action is only a harbinger of things to come. Perhaps imposing sanctions will wake them up to the current realities of our woefully unbalanced bilateral trade relationship. The message is clear—the United States will no longer tolerate the status quo.

BUDGET RESOLUTION PROTECTS DRUG PROGRAMS

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will begin debate on the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988. As chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I want to commend the House Budget Committee for doing what the President's 1988 budget fails to do—protecting the integrity of the expanded drug programs authorized in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986.

Last year, Congress passed overwhelming and sent to the President a truly historic, omnibus package of antidrug legislation. This bill, the result of a strong bipartisan effort in the Congress, added approximately \$1.7 billion to Federal drug abuse prevention and control efforts and raised the total Federal anti-drug effort to about \$4 billion in 1987.

This legislation addressed all aspects of the drug problem—international narcotics control, interdiction, enforcement, treatment, prevention and education. Congress recognized, however, that this measure, as important as it was, was only a first step, and that much more needed to be done.

When the President signed the Anti-Drug Act into law on October 27, 1986, at an elaborate White House ceremony,

many of us in Congress thought we would be able to work with the administration to sustain this renewed commitment to fighting drug trafficking and abuse. This hope was shattered just 2 months later when the President submitted his 1988 budget proposals to the Congress.

The President's budget would have cut approximately \$950 million from Federal anti-drug abuse efforts. Among the harshest cuts were those for programs authorized in the omnibus drug bill for hard pressed State and local governments that have borne the brunt of increased drug trafficking and abuse. The President's proposals would have eliminated \$225 million for drug law enforcement grants to States and localities, cut funds for drug abuse education in half from \$200 million to \$100 million and provided no additional funds for the expanded drug abuse treatment and prevention initiatives authorized in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act.

In addition, the President's budget would have cut Customs personnel by 2,000 positions, reduced the Customs air interdiction program by half, cut funds for international narcotics control efforts by \$20 million, and slashed funds for purchases of drug interdiction equipment far below 1987 levels.

The Budget Committee's resolution rejects the drastic cuts in drug programs proposed by the President. It includes approximately \$4.1 billion for all Federal drug programs in 1988, a slight increase from 1987. I am particularly pleased that the resolution preserves and protects Federal assistance for State and local governments in the areas of drug enforcement, drug abuse treatment and education.

When Congress passed the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, we made a commitment to the American people to raise the battle against drugs to a much higher Federal budgetary priority. We owe it to the citizens of our country not to renege on this important commitment. The funding levels included in the Budget Committee's blueprint provide ample flexibility to continue the anti-drug initiatives begun last year. I urge the House to support the Budget Committee's work.

□ 1220

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1988

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Budget, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-41) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE LIES THAT ARE THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Budget Democrats describe their resolution as a balance between defense and domestic cuts. That's not true. Their budget is defense cuts, unspecified taxes, and increased domestic spending.

Their budget doesn't take \$8.5 billion out of defense and the same from domestic. At best it takes \$1 billion from domestic and \$9 billion from defense and foreign affairs. Domestic spending increases are intentionally underestimated and hundreds of millions in domestic cuts are really user fees—new revenues.

Does the majority really believe that we will take \$300 million out of agriculture discretionary; that the Federal worker's pay raise will be "absorbed"; that we can save \$2 billion in energy programs without selling REA loans; that transportation spending will be lowered after last week's override? These are some of the assumptions that won't come true. They are lies. And the biggest lie of all is the assumption that this Congress will pass, and the President will sign, a \$20 billion revenue hike that doesn't include any asset sales.

Appropriators and authorizers will drill even more holes in this joke budget in the coming months, and the debt burden we pass on to our children will continue to soar.

WELCOME HOME, SUGAR RAY

(Mrs. BYRON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I usually have very nice things to say about my staff. As all of us know, our staffs are an integral part of each and every one of us. But I must tell you that mine blew it this morning.

They told me that during the 1-minute speeches I should get up and congratulate Sugar Ray Leonard on becoming the middleweight champion last night in Las Vegas. My reply was, "We should have sent the letter of congratulations last week because I am on record saying that I knew he would win."

I was keenly interested in the fight because Mr. Leonard is one of my constituents. I have inherited him from Mr. Hoyer in the other district on the other side of Maryland. He is now a resident of Potomac, MD.

Potomac is not exactly the boxing capital of the world, but we do now have the middleweight crown. My congratulations go to Sugar Ray; he took the challenge to come back; he

claimed the middleweight title, even though it was said it could not be done. It just goes to show you that with a little determination and the good right-left combination we can do it.

We have talked this morning about the budget issues. I think if we keep Sugar Ray in the ring for a while we will be able to look at the budget, look at the deficit, and move forward on our deficit reduction.

Today, in Boston, the home of the former champ, they will be going back to the dreaming of the World Series victory and thinking of things that should have been. In Maryland, we will be welcoming back Sugar Ray, the new middleweight boxing champion. Welcome home.

ACID RAIN: IT IS EVERYWHERE

(Mr. MARLENEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, acid rain, it is everywhere, it is everywhere. But today, the Canadian bells of jubilation and celebration and triumph are ringing over the accommodation given them by the President on acid rain.

I hope they realize that there are a number of us citizens who would not, and I emphasize "would not" have been so generous. If they think their smoke does not stink, they have got another thought coming. Before we shoot ourselves in the foot again, before we begin another round of "Aren't we terrible," self-incrimination, we had better look at the Canadian plants built upwind and upstream some 20 miles, some as close as 3 miles, with a heck of a lot less pollution control than our own.

As the old smoking ad used to say, "You've come a long way, baby." To our friends to the north, I say let us cut smoke screen and have cooperation all along the border.

ACID RAIN—IT IS TIME TO ACT ON THE KNOWLEDGE WE HAVE

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the question is, "Who is going to stop the acid rain? When are we going to stop playing games hiding behind research and study. When are we going to get on with the program that faces up to the issue of stopping the acid deposition that is going on across this country?"

Little did I expect 8 years ago when I, along with other Members of this House, put in place an acid deposition study program. A national study with a 10-year timeframe so that we could look at the cyclic effect of acid deposition. That this study would serve as an

excuse for inaction, as an excuse for not acting on what we know to be the factual effect and consequence of acid deposition.

Acid deposition is destroying fragile parts of our ecosystem; it is destroying that of the Canadians; it is destroying that of northern Minnesota and the Northeast part of this country. It is time to put aside the rhetoric, to put aside the shamrock conference, to put aside the good feelings and good will-type of activities and to get on with the real work and real questions that we face with regards to the environment.

I would suggest that we do that in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and that we, in spite of the fact the President has said he only wants to continue a research program. We have had enough research. It is time to act on the knowledge that we have.

OUR NEW MOSCOW EMBASSY: THE WORLD'S LARGEST MICROPHONE

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, we expect the Soviets to try to spy on the American Government, but we do not expect the State Department to help them get away with it. Unfortunately, through unbelievable negligence, that is exactly what State has done.

The marine sex-for-secrets scandal is nothing compared to the security hemorrhage that will begin if we occupy the new Embassy that State had built for us in Moscow. That Embassy building—which was built by Soviet labor according to plans drawn up by Soviet architects—is crawling with KGB bugs from top to bottom. There are bugs in the floor boards, bugs in the walls, bugs in the ceiling tiles, bugs in the steel beams. The fact is that our new Embassy in Moscow is nothing but an eight-story microphone plugged into the Politburo.

After we spent \$190 million to build the thing, the KGB has rendered it useless. Unless we want our diplomats doing business in CIA-sanitized Wine-bagos for the next 20 years, the only thing we can do is to tear the Embassy down and rebuild it.

That's why I think we should take action. As I informed the House last week, I will be offering an amendment to the State Department authorization bill which will tell the State Department to scrap the current Embassy agreement and negotiate a new one on American terms. Today I am introducing a resolution with similar language. I urge my colleagues to say no to Soviet diplomatic espionage and support this legislation.

□ 1230

YOU CAN'T HAVE IT ALL

(Mr. BERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years the foreign assistance budget has been decimated. In our struggle to reduce the deficit, many good programs have suffered, but no program has sacrificed more in absolute dollar terms than foreign aid.

Foreign assistance is not only a vital tool of national security, it gives us the means to fight poverty, illiteracy, and disease in the poorest of the developing countries.

President Reagan is correct to vehemently oppose further cuts in foreign aid; but the President is not willing to do what it takes to protect foreign aid.

Mr. President, you cannot have it all. You cannot ask for increased foreign aid without scaling back your enormous defense spending. You cannot declare that foreign aid is vital to national defense and yet be unwilling to raise revenues to pay for it. You cannot protect foreign aid and at the same time insist on blind adherence to the arbitrary levels of Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. President, it is not what you say, it is what you do that matters. What you say about increased funding for foreign aid I support. What you do is a different story. By abdicating your responsibility and by indulging yourself in irresponsible rhetoric, you are giving aid and comfort to those who would dismantle our Nation's foreign aid programs.

We need less rhetoric and more statesmanship.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT GO BACK ON ITS PROMISE OF LOWERED INDIVIDUAL TAX RATES

(Mr. LIGHTFOOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, last year we enacted historic tax reform legislation reducing individual tax rates and simplifying the Tax Code.

In exchange for lower individual tax rates, that legislation eliminated a number of exemptions and deductions. Therefore, I pledged to oppose any attempt to raise individual tax rates above the levels contained in the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

This year, I have joined a number of my colleagues in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 7 to reaffirm that pledge. House Concurrent Resolution 7 says to the American people that Congress will not go back on its promise to reduce individual tax rates

because increased taxes are not the answer to reducing budget deficits.

Congress should not go back on its word. Individual tax rates should be reduced as promised by enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

BETTER THAN BRAND X

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, American consumers know that a smart shopper is a comparison shopper.

In considering which budget plan to adopt, Members of this House should shop around.

Compare the Democratic plan with the President's budget. Don't be fooled by false advertising from the White House.

Study the contents.

In every category, the Democratic plan is a better product than brand X.

In education. In veterans. In health care. In the drug war. In low-income programs. And in cutting the deficit.

Nobody's trying to sell the President's brand X budget for one simple reason: Nobody's willing to buy it.

I ask my colleagues to compare. The Democratic plan is better than brand X. The choice is clear.

The American people should support the Democratic plan because, after all, it's your money.

A NEW FILM—MOSCOW IN THE EMBASSY

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, A couple years ago, there was a movie called *Moscow on the Hudson*. It was a comedy. Until recently, I had been unaware the State Department was remaking the film as *Moscow in the Embassy*.

Unlike its predecessor, this isn't a comedy; it's a tragedy. It has the classic elements, including hubris—or overweening arrogance of the principal players.

This overweening arrogance in our State Department is institutionalized to the extent that anything American or American made is considered inferior.

Two years ago, Ross Perot reported security lapses in Moscow. How did State respond? Fire the 50 Russians on the payroll? Use Americans to build the new Embassy complex? No—we might offend the Soviets. We can trust them—they are our friends. Besides, it's cheaper over there.

And what about reciprocity? Do the Russians use Americans to oversee construction of their new Embassy

atop the highest hill in Washington, DC. You know the building—the one with all the cute antennas aimed at the Pentagon and the White House. They don't need one aimed at State; it's probably already bugged.

The State Department should get out of the movie business and should take up the business of representing the American people. Our Ambassadors worry more about offending our allies and enemies than offending the American public.

Send the State Department officials responsible for this episode to Capistrano with the Russian swallows. They deserve each other.

REAGAN PROPOSALS CUT VETERANS PROGRAMS

(Mr. PENNY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has recently been promoting the slogan: "America is No. 1 thanks to its veterans." Unfortunately, over the past 6 years and past six budgets, the Reagan administration has never seen fit to confirm this slogan with adequate dollars for veterans' programs.

Again this year, the Reagan budget sought to eliminate VA medical care for lower priority veterans. The administration proposal left the VA medical care budget—a high priority item—\$288 million short of a current services requirement. Other well-worn Reagan proposals included cutting veterans' burial plot allowances by over \$30 million and increasing the VA home loan user fee from 1 percent to 2.5 percent. The user fee increase would have meant an additional cost to the average veteran home buyer of \$2,000 and reduced the number of veterans receiving home loans by 22,500 in 1988.

The House Budget Committee rejected these ill-conceived ideas and provided veterans' programs \$27.9 billion in budget authority and \$27.40 billion in outlays for fiscal 1988. This is an additional \$250 million in budget authority and \$650 million more in outlays than the President's budget. The House Budget Committee plan provides full inflation increases for VA medical care, research, and construction, as well as full COLA's for 2.5 million veterans with service-connected disabilities and their survivors, and \$1.2 million for those poor and elderly veterans receiving VA pensions.

Unlike the President—the House Budget Committee has made sure that our commitment to our Nation's veterans has again been met.

NO SECRETS

(Mr. McEWEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, in Moscow there are no secrets—at least not from the KGB. It is becoming increasingly apparent that American operations in the Soviet Union are conducted in a hornets' nest of spies, wiretaps and espionage. Always ready to gain even the slightest advantage for itself, the Kremlin has proven time and time again that it will stoop to any level.

By working to subject the United States and its employees, the Soviet Union has proven that Moscow is no place to conduct foreign policy. It is not the place for sensitive negotiations. It is not the place "to talk and have a meeting of the minds."

It is for these reasons that I call upon Secretary of State George Shultz to move his upcoming meeting with the Soviet Foreign Minister to a neutral site such as Helsinki or Geneva. I feel strongly that under no circumstances should Secretary Shultz allow himself to be led into the lion's den next week for these critical talks which are expected to include discussions on arms control, human rights, Embassy security, and the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. These issues are too important to the security of our Nation and our allies to be played out in an unfriendly arena.

Mr. Speaker, "home field advantage" is one thing, but when your adversary uses that edge to undermine the very foundation of our security—and in this case, we're talking about a life and death situation—then the "visiting team" ought to either insist on a neutral site or refuse to participate.

COMPARING HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE PLAN TO PRESIDENT'S BUDGET (BRAND X) REGARDING LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

(Mr. ESPY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for the opportunity of addressing my colleagues for 1 minute to compare the House Budget Committee plan to the President's budget, which is shown here as brand X. I would like to do that with regard to emphasis on low-income programs.

The House budget plan provides for full benefits for the AFDC 3.8 million family caseload in fiscal year 1988. Brand X, on the other hand, proposed restrictions on eligibility and punitive enforcement of error rate assumptions.

The House budget plan provides for full funding of the child nutrition pro-

grams. Brand X would have eliminated 5 to 8 million children from the programs through restricting eligibility.

The House budget plan provides for full funding of WIC at the CBO baseline, plus an additional \$100 million for expanded coverage. Brand X, on the other hand, proposed a decrease of \$50 million below the CBO baseline.

The House budget plan provides for full funding of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Brand X, on the other hand, proposed to reduce this program by 33 percent, which could have eliminated 3 million program participants.

The House budget plan provides for full funding of low-income housing assistance programs. Brand X, Mr. Speaker, proposed the reduction of funding for assisted housing programs by 50 percent and would change the program to rely completely on vouchers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been a member of the House Budget Committee which in my opinion has met its task of proposing real and permanent deficit reduction while continuing to address some of the serious domestic needs and problems within our country.

□ 1240

THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET— TAX AND SPEND, SPEND AND TAX

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from a number of the Budget Committee Democrats today talking about how much more money they are going to spend in various areas. I think that the American people also ought to understand that in order to spend all of this additional money, they have also raised taxes, and that is the way in which they are going to come up with all the increased spending, and that is the way that they are going to reduce deficits—they are going to do it with taxes.

That is what we do best around here in Congress: We tax and we spend; we spend and we tax; we tax and we spend; we spend and we tax. That is the only thing we do around here. That is the only thing that the Democratic budget does—it taxes and spends, and the American people pay the bills.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Pursuant to the provision of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered,

or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4, rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Wednesday, April 8, 1987.

RE-REFERRAL OF MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT CON- CERNING STEPS TAKEN TO IM- PLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SPECIAL REVIEW BOARD

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President of the United States concerning steps taken to implement recommendations of the Special Review Board, chaired by former Senator John Tower, which was laid before the House and ordered to be printed on March 31, 1987, be additionally referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk will call the eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING FOR RESTORATION OF FEDERAL RECOGNITION TO CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES OF TEXAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 318) to provide for the restoration of Federal recognition to the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and the Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

MICHIGAN WILDERNESS HERITAGE ACT OF 1987

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 148) to designate certain public lands in the State of Michigan as wilderness, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 148

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this

Act may be cited as the "Michigan Wilderness Heritage Act of 1987".

Sec. 2. In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 1131), the following lands in the State of Michigan are hereby designated as wilderness, and therefore as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System—

(a) subject to valid existing rights and reasonable access to exercise such rights, certain lands in the Manistee National Forest, comprising approximately three thousand four hundred and fifty acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Nordhouse Dunes Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the Nordhouse Dunes Wilderness;

(b) certain lands in the Ottawa National Forest, comprising approximately eighteen thousand three hundred and twenty five acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Sylvania Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the Sylvania Wilderness;

(c) certain lands in the Ottawa National Forest, comprising approximately fourteen thousand eight hundred and fifty acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Sturgeon River Gorge Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the Sturgeon River Gorge Wilderness;

(d) certain lands in the Hiawatha National Forest, comprising approximately four thousand six hundred and forty acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Rock River Canyon Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the Rock River Canyon Wilderness;

(e) certain lands in the Hiawatha National Forest, comprising approximately five thousand four hundred and sixty acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Big Island Lake Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the Big Island Lake Wilderness;

(f) certain lands in the Hiawatha National Forest, comprising approximately twelve thousand two hundred and thirty acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mackinac Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the Mackinac Wilderness;

(g) certain lands in the Hiawatha National Forest, comprising approximately three thousand seven hundred and ninety acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Horseshoe Bay Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and shall be known as the Horseshoe Bay Wilderness;

(h) certain lands in the Hiawatha National Forest, comprising approximately eleven thousand eight hundred and seventy acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Delirium Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the Delirium Wilderness;

(i) certain lands in the Hiawatha National Forest, comprising approximately two hundred and fourteen acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Les Cheneaux Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the Les Cheneaux Wilderness;

(j) certain lands in the Hiawatha National Forest, comprising approximately three hundred and seventy-seven acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Round Island Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the Round Island Wilderness;

(k) certain lands in the Ottawa National Forest, comprising approximately sixteen thousand eight hundred and fifty acres as

generally depicted on a map entitled "McCormick Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1987, and which shall be known as the McCormick Wilderness.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file maps and legal descriptions of each wilderness area designated by this Act with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, and each such map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however*, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be made. Each such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. Subject to valid existing rights, each wilderness area designated by this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act of 1964 governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas except that with respect to any area designated in this Act, any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act of 1964 shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 5. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Department of Agriculture has completed the second roadless area review and evaluation program (RARE II); and

(2) the Congress has made its own review and examination of National Forest System roadless areas in the State of Michigan and of the environmental impacts associated with alternative allocations of such areas.

(b) On the basis of such review, the Congress hereby determines and directs that—

(1) without passing on the question of the legal and factual sufficiency of the RARE II final environmental statement (dated January 1979) with respect to National Forest System lands in the State of Michigan; such statement shall not be subject to judicial review with respect to National Forest System lands in the State of Michigan;

(2) with respect to the National Forest System lands in the State of Michigan which were reviewed by the Department of Agriculture in the second roadless area review and evaluation (RARE II) and those lands referred to in subsection (d), that review and evaluation or reference shall be deemed for the purposes of the initial land management plans required for such lands by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, to be an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the revisions of the plans, but shall review the wilderness option when the plans are revised, which revisions will ordinarily occur on a ten-year cycle, or at least every fifteen years, unless, prior to such time, the Secretary of Agriculture finds that conditions in a unit have significantly changed;

(3) areas in the State of Michigan reviewed in such final environmental statement or references in subsection (d) and not designated wilderness upon enactment of this Act shall be managed for multiple enactment of this Act shall be managed for multiple use in accordance with land man-

agement plans pursuant to section 9 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976: *Provided*, That such areas need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation prior to or during revision of the initial land management plans;

(4) in the event that revised land management plans in the State of Michigan are implemented pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and other applicable law, areas not recommended for wilderness designation need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation prior to or during revision of such plans, and areas recommended for wilderness designation shall be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation as may be required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and other applicable law; and

(5) unless expressly authorized by Congress, the Department of Agriculture shall not conduct any further statewide roadless area review and evaluation of National Forest System lands in the State of Michigan for the purpose of determining their suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(c) As used in this section, and as provided in section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, the term "revision" shall not include an "amendment" to a plan.

(d) The provisions of this section shall also apply to National Forest System roadless lands in the State of Michigan which are less than five thousand acres in size.

SEC. 6. Congress does not intend that designation of wilderness areas in the State of Michigan lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around each wilderness area. The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within the wilderness shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness.

SEC. 7. As provided in section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of Michigan with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests in Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this measure, H.R. 148, is essentially identical to a bill which passed the House in the last Congress,

but upon which the Senate was unable to complete action. The bill will designate 11 wilderness areas in the national forests of Michigan totaling some 92,000 acres. It would complete the RARE II process for Michigan, and would release over 21,000 acres of national forest land for other than wilderness designation, which were reviewed as part of the RARE II process.

After its enactment only about 3.4 percent of all of Michigan's national forest land would be designated as wilderness, and the remaining 96.6 percent would be nonwilderness.

The areas dealt with in the bill are diverse, and contain a multitude of natural, scenic, historic, and other resources and values. They are without exception well-deserving of the wilderness designation and the protection that goes with it.

They include one of the last remaining undeveloped stretches of land on Lake Michigan's eastern shore, and dozens of major lakes, often connected with canoe portage trails, spectacular waterfalls and canyon areas, forests and swamps, and rapid-flowing streams and islands. Together they represent a priceless part of the natural heritage of the upper Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the work that our National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee has achieved with this measure's consideration. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] has been a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for the past 10 years, in which we both have had the privilege to serve and work on such wilderness issues. He has done yeoman service in putting this measure together with extreme patience, and I think a great deal of sensitivity to this natural-resource base and process.

These areas have been studied extensively by the Forest Service under the RARE II plan, and have at one time or another been recommended by the Forest Service for such designation that we bring before the House today.

Indeed, it represents really the last chance to take areas that are often close to densely populated areas in the State of Michigan, and to in fact designate them as wilderness to preserve and to provide an adequate degree of protection to these resources.

Mr. KILDEE is a very valued member for his service on the committee, not just with regards to this issue, but surely with regards to all of the work that he does on the Interior Committee, and our subcommittee. This legislation the Michigan Wilderness is an especially important area, because it affects Mr. KILDEE's State, and he has put together a coalition of Members on a bipartisan basis which in fact appeared before the committee in support of this measure and serve as spon-

sors as well on H.R. 148. He has surely earned my praise and thanks for his diligent work.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the subcommittee chairman Mr. VENTO has pointed out, H.R. 148 would designate 11 Forest Service areas in Michigan as wilderness. This will add another 92,000 acres of wilderness to the national wilderness system which has already grown to over 80 million acres, an area bigger than the country of England. Three areas covering 22,000 acres will be released from further consideration as wilderness.

Mr. Speaker, although no votes were cast against H.R. 148 at full committee or subcommittee, there were objections raised by the Forest Service when we held hearings on the bill. The Forest Service was primarily concerned with the Nordhouse Dunes area which is underlain with private minerals. The Forest Service pointed out that there are 1,985 acres of privately owned mineral rights and 675 acres of State owned mineral rights. Another 684 acres of Federal mineral rights are currently under lease. The Forest Service objects, and I believe rightfully so, to placing private minerals in wilderness because it creates a legal and political tug of war. On the one hand the Forest Service is charged with protecting the wilderness character of the area and on the other hand the Forest Service is supposed to allow the owners of the private minerals their right to reasonable access to exercise their private property rights.

I still believe that it is bad public policy to place privately held minerals into wilderness areas. Nevertheless, I must commend my colleague from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE for making every effort to accommodate my concerns. Mr. KILDEE assured the subcommittee and the full committee that the Congress in conjunction with the State is diligently working with the mineral owners to provide reasonable access where possible and reasonable alternatives where access is not possible. Members should be aware that H.R. 148 provides that the Nordhouse Dunes Wilderness Area is subject to valid existing rights and reasonable access to exercise those rights. Furthermore, the committee has prepared extensive report language directing the Forest Service to work out an equitable solution with the owners of the private minerals.

Finally Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress that the area designated as the Sylvania Wilderness contains several lakes on which motorboats are currently used. The committee recognizes in the report accompanying this bill that such preexisting use may be per-

mitted to continue under section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act.

□ 1250

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests, Family Farms, and Energy.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 148, the Michigan Wilderness Heritage Act.

This bill was referred jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs. The Agriculture Committee's Forests, Family Farms, and Energy Subcommittee, which I chair, held a public hearing on H.R. 148 on March 18, 1987, and approved the bill on March 24 by voice vote. The full Agriculture Committee ordered the bill reported on April 1, again by voice vote.

In testimony before our subcommittee, the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service representative endorsed the designation of 8 of the 11 areas proposed for wilderness by this bill. Because we often concentrate on points of contention, I want to highlight the fact that Sylvania, Sturgeon River Gorge, McCormick, Rock River Canyon, Big Island Lakes, Mackinaw, Horseshoe Bay, and Round Island are all supported for wilderness designation by the sponsors of H.R. 148, the Forest Service, the State of Michigan, and all others who appeared before our subcommittee.

The three areas which the Forest Service oppose for wilderness designation are Nordhouse Dunes, Government Island, and Delirium. Of these areas, the one which seems to generate the most concern is Nordhouse Dunes.

Although the Nordhouse Dunes area does contain some privately held mineral rights, the Forest Service noted that the area's physical characteristics qualify for wilderness designation.

In fact, the Forest Service has recommended Nordhouse Dunes for wilderness designation on two separate occasions. In its second roadless area review and evaluation, and again in the forest management plan for the Huron-Manistee National Forests, the Forest Service recommended inclusion of Nordhouse Dunes in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Notwithstanding the concerns expressed by the Forest Service, our subcommittee heard recommendations for the enactment of H.R. 148, in its entirety, from cosponsors on both sides of the aisle, from the Governor of Michigan and the State's department of natural resources, and from local environmental and citizens' groups.

In addition, we are told that this bill is supported by the Michigan forest products industry development council, marking the first time that any

wilderness bill has been endorsed by such an organization.

In total, H.R. 148 would give wilderness designation to 11 of the 14 roadless areas inventoried by the Forest Service in Michigan, amounting to just over 92,000 acres. The three roadless areas which remain, totaling over 21,500 acres, would be released for multiple-use management under the so-called release/sufficiency provision of the bill, which states that the Forest Service will not be required to review the lands further prior to a revision of the forest management plan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the chief sponsor of this bill, for his diligent work in crafting a most reasonable bill. Our subcommittee was impressed by the statements of support we received from cosponsors on both sides of the aisle.

This measure has bipartisan support and it is endorsed by environmentalists and industry. I believe it deserves our support as well.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 148, the Michigan Wilderness Heritage Act. H.R. 148 would add approximately 92,000 acres of national forest land to the wilderness system. Ten of the 11 tracts of land are in Michigan's Upper Peninsula which is part of my district. This designation is not the best way to manage our natural resources in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. The wilderness designation is far too restrictive for an area whose economy is so heavily dependent on its natural resources. Permanently restricting these areas with the wilderness designation will mean that the Forest Service will not have any discretionary powers to manage the forest as they see fit. The Forest Service employs forest management professionals who are better able to recommend management techniques for these areas. Wilderness designation takes away the ability of the local foresters to make changes as the areas change.

My definition of conservation is the wise use of our natural resources, not the nonuse. I do not feel this bill is a wise use of these areas. Last year almost 12 percent of the people of Michigan's Upper Peninsula were unemployed. Although I do not believe this designation will increase unemployment, any further restrictions placed on the ability of our people to use their natural resources will have a negative impact on future investment and expansion of our forest products industries. In our area the forest products industry creates numerous jobs and contributes significantly to our local economy. Supporters of this bill

say that there is no wilderness in Michigan. They also contend the bill will dramatically increase the number of tourists drawn to the area. I do not agree with either of these arguments. It is true there are no Federal wilderness areas, however there are several areas that offer the same wilderness experience.

These areas include Isle Royale, the Porcupine Mountain State Park, Tahquamenon Falls Park, Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore and the Seney Wildlife Refuge. In summary, I oppose H.R. 148 because of the permanent restrictive designation it places on our local economy. As the Detroit News said in a recent editorial, the bill is "neither useful nor helpful in the management of Michigan's forest, deer herds, and other natural resources, and it would be a hindrance to the State's second largest industry, tourism." There is one other issue I would like to address, Mr. Speaker. By passing this legislation, we are saying, in effect, that a land-use decision such as this is better made in Washington than in northern Michigan. The message it sends to the people in northern Michigan is, "we don't trust you to make wise decisions with your resources and we need to protect those resources from you." I disagree. We who live in northern Michigan know how lucky we are to be surrounded by such beauty. That's why we live there. It is neither fair nor justified to presume that we are unable to strike the necessary balance between resource development and preservation at the local level.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman on his wise evaluation of wilderness legislation. Of course, he represents an area most dramatically affected by this, and of course the gentleman realizes, I am sure, that wilderness designation is quite restrictive with regard to recreation. Just because we have wilderness designation does not mean that the area will be cared for any more or less than it would have been had it not been under the Forest Service management, but simply the fact that we are restricting it dramatically with the types and forms of recreation that may take place within those wilderness designations.

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. The gentleman is absolutely correct. It is the most restrictive way that we can designate land. It means you can do practically nothing in it. And believe me, I have lived my whole life in this area and spent a great deal of time flying over the area. If you want a wilderness experience, you can go anywhere in my congressional district and find areas that are not specifically designated as

wilderness areas, but believe me, they are wilderness.

When one depends upon the forest products industry for their livelihood, and with an unemployment rate, as indicated, that last year was 12 percent, and right now it is probably 15 or 16 percent, you have to do things to be able to protect the economy, to be able to make sure that in the future you will be able to have the wise use of those natural resources, as I indicated, not be nonuse.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], a member of the committee and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 148, the Michigan Wilderness Heritage Act of 1987 will designate as wilderness some 92,000 acres, about two-tenths of 1 percent of the commercial forest land in Michigan.

H.R. 148 is virtually identical to the bill which this House passed overwhelmingly in September 1985.

The only changes to the bill from the last Congress are minor border adjustments to reflect some concerns by the Forest Service.

The 11 proposed wilderness areas in the bill include unique examples of Michigan's varied flora, fauna and geography.

Some of the last remaining stands of Virgin Forest in Michigan and the many rare and threatened plant species found in these areas provide habitat for bald eagles, moose, black bear, white-tailed deer, sandhill cranes, great blue herons and many other varieties of wildlife.

The areas contain river canyons hundreds of feet deep filled with wild rivers, waterfalls and wetlands; lakeshore sand dunes and beaches; winter ice caves and chains of granite-rimmed lakes.

The bill retains the language worked out with the minority in last Congress which reiterates the protection of valid existing rights, in particular those of the private subsurface owners in the nordhouse dunes area.

I am particularly grateful to the gentleman from Montana, [Mr. MARLENEE] for his sensitive concern in this matter.

Moreover, I am pleased that Chairman UDALL has agreed to keep the committee report language of the last Congress which laid out guidelines for the Forest Service regarding its mandate to preserve the wilderness characteristics of the area while protecting the rights of the subsurface owners.

Under the State of Michigan law, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources has the authority to issue or deny drilling permits in Michigan. A representative of the DNR who testified before the Interior and Agriculture Committees, has informed me of private discussions between the DNR, the Forest Service and the private subsurface owners.

He assured me that the three parties are attempting to work out a mutually agreeable compromise which will protect the subsurface owners' rights and the environment of the Nordhouse dunes area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep appreciation to my colleagues in the Michigan delegation who have given their continued support to my efforts to move this bill through the House.

I would also like to thank Chairmen UDALL, DE LA GARZA, VENTO, and VOLKMER for expediting the hearings and markups on H.R. 148 in the committees and subcommittees which have jurisdiction over the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that H.R. 148 strikes a good balance between the development and preservation of the last remaining vestiges of wilderness left in Michigan.

The tremendous support for H.R. 148 from 11 of my colleagues in the Michigan delegation; from Gov. Jim Blanchard; from national and local environmental groups; and from the timber industry in Michigan are ample proof that we have succeeded in achieving that balance.

Mr. Speaker, some people have questioned the need for wilderness designation for these 11 unique areas in Michigan.

They cite the authority the Forest Service has to administer the areas in a manner similar to wilderness. However, as you and I both know, Congress is the board of directors for the Nation.

We must set policy for the executive agencies to implement.

By approving H.R. 148, the Congress will permanently set aside these 11 areas to be preserved much as they came from the hand of God.

They will be protected not only from man-made disturbances but also from changes in the bureaucratic whims of each new administration here in Washington.

□ 1300

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], and would like to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation for his shepherding and love of this

bill and what it stands for and his help in bring this to the floor of the House again in this Congress. The gentleman has done a marvelous job in dealing with 93,000 acres of unique Michigan wilderness lands. I commend him for it.

I might also add that the previous speaker mentioned the Detroit News and alluded to the fact that they have some difficulties with this bill. They have always had very little difficulty in spelling Mr. KILDEE's name right, or especially my name, but they seem to have misspelled Nordhouse Dunes. I would suggest to them that you do not spell dunes, d-o-o-n-s; it is d-u-n-e-s. To the extent that they can recognize that, I think we are going to be further ahead in terms of being able to discuss this issue with them.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 148, the Michigan Wilderness Heritage Act of 1987. This bill passed the House in the 99th Congress, but unfortunately was not considered by the Senate. This bill will designate Federal lands in my State, currently part of the National Forest System, as wilderness, preserving it from certain development activities. Wilderness is one of the multiple uses of forest lands defined by the National Forest Management Act of 1976. But even before this, Congress recognized the value of wilderness by establishing the Wilderness Act of 1964, mandating the Forest Service to inventory their lands and recommend additions to the National Wilderness System, established by the act.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 148 includes approximately 92,000 acres of national forest land in Michigan. This represents roughly 3 percent of the 2.7 million acres of national forest land in the State, and a very small fraction of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources' estimate of 17.5 million acres of forested lands in the State.

Yet within these confines are some of Michigan's finest remaining wildlands. Sylvania is a popular summer and winter vacation spot which draws extensively from the urban recreational crowd of Milwaukee and Chicago. Sylvania is teeming with eagles and waterfowl, otters, and within it stands Michigan's largest red pine.

The McCormick tract, Mr. Speaker, is a recent addition to the National Forest System and has been managed as de facto wilderness since the late 1970's. It is one of the few remaining stands of virgin hemlock and white pine in the State. It is also the site of ongoing integrative forest studies by many of the State's acclaimed ecologists.

It is my understanding that forest industrialists and environmentalists in the State have agreed to support this legislation. I think that this is vital because although the wilderness designation will prohibit road construction, off-road vehicles and logging, it is still a multiuse philosophy which restricts as little as possible, while maintaining a primary goal to preserve a unique ecosystem intact.

These 11 Michigan areas are deserving of this special stewardship and will bring new examples of unique ecosystems into the National Wilderness Preservation System. Among

them are Great Lakes sand dunes, north country riparian systems and inland lake complexes.

What will be permitted in the wilderness? I think this is a useful question. Hunting, fishing, trapping, backpacking—and other nonmotorized recreation activities; U.S. Forest Service fire control, insect and disease control and medical evacuations; mineral and oil and gas exploration for companies with subsurface rights, if they agree to proceed in a manner compatible with the preservation of wilderness.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this land will not be locked up. On the contrary, it will be available for generations to come.

Henry David Thoreau said "We can never have enough nature." I couldn't agree more. Today we seek to preserve one-quarter of 1 percent of my State. I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation which is here before us because of the hard work of our colleague DALE KILDEE.

H.R. 148 will further my State's effort to preserve its natural beauty for future generations. I ask that the House match the efforts of my State by passing this fair and farsighted legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin, first of all, by commending the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] for the leadership he has shown on this issue.

I also acknowledge with appreciation the chairman's role, the gentleman from Missouri, as well as the ranking Republican from Montana, for their having facilitated and expedited bringing this wilderness designation bill to the floor in a very quick manner.

This is, as has already been pointed out, very substantially the same as legislation which we passed on this floor in the 99th Congress. I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that support for this legislation within the Michigan delegation is, indeed, broad. A clear majority of the delegation does support the legislation. Republicans and Democrats have, in fact, been very active in seeking to secure its enactment.

We came within a whisker in the 99th Congress of seeing this legislation passed into law, and with some modest disagreements between this body and the other body, we failed in last-minute attempts to successfully resolve the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this year we can do that. I believe that this bill does, in fact, strike a balance between the preservation of surface areas of beauty and natural uniqueness which

will never be replaced if we lose them and the private property rights of those who own the subsurface mineral rights.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend, again, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] for his leadership and to urge a strong and forceful vote in support of this legislation.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there will be controversy with this bill, as there always is in almost every wilderness measure we consider.

My purpose in making a statement during the consideration of this measure is to assure all Members of the House that this bill has been subjected to the appropriate process. As has been mentioned, it was similar to the bill passed in 1985. It passed then under suspension. The difference perhaps this time is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] and myself and our Subcommittee on Forests, Family Farms and Energy in the Committee on Agriculture intend to review these rather thoroughly.

We have had an appropriate hearing on this measure. We find, indeed, it is well-balanced and it came out of our subcommittee and out of the Committee on Agriculture with endorsement.

We notice, in looking at the balance, on Federal forest lands within the State of Michigan that 3.4 percent of that forest land would be set aside under this wilderness designation. There is currently no land under that designation and we seem to have fairly broad support from the delegation from that State for this particular set-aside.

There is appropriate release language, and it is compatible with the U.S. Forest Service obligation to manage our precious forest resources.

I intend to support this measure on final passage.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 148, the Michigan Wilderness bill, and to encourage my colleagues to vote for its passage. I want to congratulate Congressman KILDEE on his leadership on this excellent piece legislation.

This is an important piece of legislation for Michigan. According to the Sierra Club, there currently is not a single acre of Michigan's vast national forest tracts which is part of the National Wilderness Preservation System, a system that gives the necessary strong protection to wilderness areas. And those wilderness areas which are in the bill that are outside of the national forests are overused. For instance, the fragile ecosystem of

Isle Royal National Park, of the Keweenaw Peninsula in Lake Superior, recurrently has had to compete with overuse, despite being rather remote. Not only is it a Great Lake island, but it is far removed from any population center on the mainland as well. This is clear testimony to the genuine necessity for more wilderness area in Michigan.

We are not talking here about a lot of land. The total acreage is just over 90,000. That represents under one-third of 1 percent of Michigan's total land base. The great majority of the proposed wilderness areas are in the UP, the Upper Peninsula. The proposed wilderness is less than 1 percent of the UP's land base, just under 3 percent of the State's national forest land, and just one-fifth of 1 percent of all Michigan's commercial forest land.

Economic impact is one of the determinants of whether areas should be designated as wilderness. The statistics I've just cited, vis-a-vis the size of the proposed wilderness area in relation to total land base and forest land, indicate the small amount of land and forest the areas contained in the legislation include, both in relation to the entire land base of the State and the Upper Peninsula. In addition, the wilderness designation will not have any impact on air quality permitting of new industrial sites because of clean air regulations. Most of the acreage has a class II PSD—prevention of significant deterioration—designation under the Federal Clean Air Act. Two of the areas, Isle Royal National Park and the Seney National Wildlife Area, are class I. Siting of powerplants, for instance, has occurred in other regions of the country close to PSD class I areas. Michigan's economy clearly will benefit from the designation of additional wilderness areas. A reasonable increase in wilderness areas, as this bill calls for, clearly will enhance the attractiveness of the parts of the State where these areas are located and the State as a whole as places to visit. This can only produce added economic advantage from enhanced tourist business.

Another determinant of wilderness designation is the effect it will have on people in the area. It should be pointed out that perimeters of the proposed areas have been established so that private property therein is excluded as much as possible.

What we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, is establishing a wilderness component of a land use program that is a balance of environmental protection and sensible development. Autos, snowmobiles, powerboats and other vehicles provide the means for many people to enjoy Michigan's natural resources. Extensive efforts are made to assure such opportunities. But there also should be areas where the canoe, snowshoe, and hiking boot prevail as

the primary means of travel. It is important to preserve some wild areas where we can enjoy a nonmechanized nature experience and safeguard significant natural areas and wildlife habitats. Just as we encourage careful development in some areas, we should set aside other areas for preservation.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been a proponent of sound environmental policy—throughout my public career. Legislation I previously have supported includes the major Alaska Wilderness and Redwood Park expansion bills. While a member of the Michigan Senate, I authored the State's Resource Recovery Act and led a cleanup of dying Michigan recreational lakes.

The Roman lawyer and satirist Juvenal once said: "Nature and wisdom always say the same." Mr. Speaker, I consider approval of the Michigan wilderness bill a wise investment in our future. I urge my colleagues to give their full support to this bill.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to express my strong support for H.R. 148, the Michigan Wilderness Heritage Act of 1987. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important and needed legislation, and I extend my thanks to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], for his tireless efforts in helping preserve Michigan's wilderness lands.

My support for this bill is rooted in my belief that there is a clear and growing danger to wilderness lands throughout the United States. Each year the pace of development claims a greater share of our wilderness lands. In Michigan, which possesses more Forest Service land than any other State east of the Mississippi River, the land is gradually losing its wilderness character. If we do not stop this despoilment, our legacy to our grandchildren could be a State without wilderness lands. H.R. 148 provides us with an opportunity to preserve the land for present and future generations.

H.R. 148 would designate 92,000 acres of northern Michigan as wilderness. Wilderness status means no construction of roads or building, no mining, logging, or other activities that would alter the land's natural character.

The proposed wilderness areas to be designated as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System include the North-house Dunes Wilderness in the Manistee National Forest; the Sylvania Wilderness in the Ottawa National Forest; the Sturgeon River Gorge Wilderness in the Ottawa National Forest; the Rock River Canyon Wilderness in the Hiawatha National Forest; the Big Island Lake Wilderness in the Hiawatha National Forest; the Mackinac Wilderness in the Hiawatha National Forest; the Horseshoe Bay Wilderness in the Hiawatha National Forest; the Delirium Wilderness in the Hiawatha National Forest; the Les Cheneaux Wilderness in the Hiawatha National Forest; the Round Island Wilderness in the Hiawatha National Forest; and the McCormick Wilderness in the Ottawa National Forest.

I also want to add that while H.R. 148 protects these 92,000 acres, at the same time it provides for the rights of sportsmen, hikers, and researchers, to name a few, to enjoy and

study the land. Indeed, this is the whole purpose of the legislation: to maintain these wilderness areas for present and future generations to enjoy.

Again, I am grateful to Representative KILDEE for his hard work on this legislation. I urge passage of H.R. 148.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 148, the Michigan Wilderness Heritage Act of 1987. I was also a cosponsor of this legislation when it was overwhelmingly approved in the 99th Congress. Unfortunately, a similar Senate bill never came to a vote in that Chamber.

H.R. 148 designates 92,000 acres, less than 3.3 percent of Michigan's three national forests, as national forest wilderness. Michigan, with more Forest Service land than any other State east of the Mississippi, currently has no national forest land with the coveted "protected wilderness" designation.

The 11 areas to be designated wilderness include unique examples of Michigan's varied plants, wildlife and geography. The areas contain river canyons, waterfalls, wild rivers, lake-shore sand dunes and beaches, winter ice caves and chains of granite-rimmed lakes. In addition to the phenomenal geography, these areas provide habitat for bald eagles, moose, black bear, white-tailed deer, sandhill cranes, Great Blue herons and many other varieties of wildlife.

H.R. 148 is an excellent balance between the development and the conservation of Michigan's forests. Proof of that balance is the endorsement of H.R. 148 by a bipartisan group of 12 Michigan Representatives, Michigan Gov. James Blanchard, the Sierra Club and Wilderness Society, and the Michigan Forest Products Industry Development Council.

As a result of hearings held in Washington and Michigan's Upper Peninsula, the Interior Committee has added several amendments to H.R. 148. The amendments reiterate the sportsmen's right to hunt, fish, and trap in the proposed areas, emphasize the ability of owners of gas or oil leases to exercise their rights, and prevents the establishment of "buffer zones" around the areas. Language was added that will release 22,000 acres currently in wilderness study areas for future timber harvest—these acres are not designated as wilderness in H.R. 148. The boundaries of the proposed wilderness areas have been carefully drawn to exclude private property wherever possible while improving the Forest Service's ability to preserve several of the State's unique ecosystems.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 148, the Michigan Wilderness Heritage Act of 1987. I enjoy the beauty the State of Michigan offers and hope it can be preserved for future generations.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but let me say in closing that I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], for the work and attempt he has made to moderate all of the concerns that all of us have had about wilderness legislation.

I would also like to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE]. He made every attempt to ally those concerns that we had about mineral rights, access to private holdings, those sorts of things.

I think that we can revisit this issue should problems arise with the Forest Service management of that wilderness area.

I commend those who were involved in the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1310

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE] for his cooperation during the Michigan Wilderness hearings, and I thank him for the questions he raised during the hearings. Because of that we will have additional information forthcoming providing a better insight into the wilderness designations and the forest lands east of the Mississippi, along with the types of problems that have occurred in terms of purchase of inholdings and other types of rights in those areas which often have been portrayed as costly. In fact, we think there have been very few instances when that practice has been followed, and the cost of it, considering the overall designation of eastern wilderness designations in the eastern forests, has been truly modest.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue. As has been outlined before, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] has done an outstanding job in terms of presenting this to the committee and working out the compromises which are an inherent part of this Michigan wilderness measure which we bring to the floor today. I would ask that every Member support this measure because of its inherent merit it deserves our support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 148, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 18 OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1728) to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide for limited extension of alternative means of providing assistance under the School Lunch Program.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1728

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 18 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) Upon request to the Secretary, any school district that on January 1, 1987, was receiving all cash payments or all letters of credit in lieu of entitlement commodities for its school lunch program shall receive all cash payments or all letters of credit in lieu of entitlement commodities for its school lunch program for each school year ending before July 1, 1992.

"(2) Any school district that elects under paragraph (1) to receive all cash payments or all letters of credit in lieu of entitlement commodities for its school lunch program shall receive bonus commodities in the same manner as if such school district was receiving all entitlement commodities for its school lunch program."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1987, the Committee on Education and Labor reported by unanimous vote, an original bill, H.R. 1728, to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide for a limited extension of alternative means of providing assistance under the School Lunch Program.

This limited extension is necessary because current authority for 64 school districts, which were participating in a congressionally mandated alternative program, using either a cash or commodity letter of credit as of January 1, of this year, will expire on June 30, 1987, without this extension.

In view of the fact that the Congress is actively considering major improvements in the traditional commodity distribution program, as well as the relative merits of cash and commodity letters of credit, the Committee on Education and Labor believes that this limited extension provision in H.R. 1728 will prevent unnecessary and

costly disruptions in these School Lunch Program operations.

The Congressional Budget Office has provided estimates on the costs involved in implementing this legislation. In reporting H.R. 1728, it was the committee's belief that there should be no significant costs associated with the extension of an existing program of cash and commodity letters of credit programs. Such costs, in our view, should be paid for out of existing audit and evaluation funds or unobligated State administrative expense moneys, as they have done for the past several years. Hearings were held last May 15, during the 99th Congress, and this year on March 19.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to indicate that apparently we were too late to get the list of cosigners of the bill in, and I would like to read the names of those cosigners: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules and consider H.R. 1728, a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to extend the authority of a limited number of school districts to continue to operate either cash or commodity letter of credit programs, as alternatives to the traditional commodity donation program.

I do this primarily because of the feedback we received from the districts that are participating. These are the things they tell us: first of all, they have increased acceptability and a variety of school lunch menus, and particularly on the secondary level, if you are going to keep them coming to the lunchroom, you certainly had better have acceptability and variety.

They have increased student participation and reduced local labor, transportation, and food storage costs.

Someday I think we will discover that as a matter of fact it is not very smart to buy on the Federal level, store on the Federal level, ship by the Federal Government, store on the State level, ship by the State level, store on the local level if you have any room to store, and if you do not, you then send it out and pay to store it, and then you also send it back out to have it processed because you cannot use what has been sent there in the first place. My hope is, as I said, that someday maybe we will be as lucky as Kansas. Is it not amazing that we have 50 States and one of those 50 States has cash only? They get bonus commodities as everybody else does, but somehow or other, before I came to the Congress of the United States, they were out there all by themselves

with cash only, and they love it; they are doing well, and the children apparently love it, too, because they participate well.

So I would hope that these other 64 districts, none of which, I might say, are in my district, will be able to continue to participate until we get a real specific report using the kinds of suggestions and data and raising the kinds of questions that Chairman Ford and I have indicated we think they should use when they are making this kind of an evaluation. So it is my hope that they would continue this program.

According to the provisions incorporated in the bill, only those school districts that were participating in an alternative program as of January 1 of this year will be given the option to continue with the alternative they are currently operating. Some 64 school districts are involved and the bill before us this afternoon applies to only these districts.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to include extraneous matter, I will include at the end of my remarks a listing of the specific school districts in question.

Thirty-one projects are so-called cash sites which have received cash in lieu of entitlement commodities; and 28 projects are so-called CLOC sites which have received commodity letters of credit [CLOC's] in lieu of entitlement commodities. Five cash projects which participated in earlier congressionally mandated studies are also included.

All of these pilot school districts will continue to receive "bonus" commodities, largely dairy products, in the form of bonus commodities—not bonus cash or bonus commodity letters of credit.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that those school districts which have been operating either a cash or commodity letter of credit alternative program have reported some very positive results. These include:

Increased acceptability of and variety in school lunch menus;

Increased student participation; and

Reduced local labor, transportation, and food storage costs.

H.R. 1728 would allow these school districts, at their option, to continue to participate in either cash or commodity letter of credit alternative programs, until June 30, 1992. Current statutory providing for alternative programs expires June 30, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, there should, at best, be minimum costs associated with this limited extension—costs which can be absorbed out of existing evaluation or State administrative expense accounts.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in adopting the motion to suspend the rules and approve H.R. 1728.

Mr. Speaker, the cash in lieu sites, CLOC sites, and commodity sites are as follows:

CASH IN LIEU SITES

Adams Co. Sch. Dist. No. 50, Mary Gumm, School Food Director, 4476 West 68th Avenue, Westminster, CO 80030 (303) 426-0556.

Amarillo Indep. Sch. District, Sheila Taylor, Food Director, 910 West 8th Street, Amarillo, TX 79101, (806) 376-5531.

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Bonnie Baehr, School Food Director, 222 N. 17th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103, (215) 587-3767.

Bremerton Public Schools, Jackie Love, Food Service Coordinator, 300 N. Montgomery, Bremerton, WA 98310 (206) 478-5106.

Brodhead School District, Debbie Anderson Bookkeeper 406 10th Street, Brodhead, WI 53520 (608) 897-8249.

Caddo Parish School District, Paula Rhodes, P.O. Box 32000, Shreveport, LA 71130 (318) 636-0210.

Converse Co. Sch. Dist. No. 2, Jim Hoyt, Superintendent, 212 South 3rd. Box 1300, Glenrock, WY 82637 (307) 436-5331.

Edgefield County Sch. Dist., Mary Tuten, Supervisor, Food Service P.O. Box 178, Edgefield, SC 29824, (803) 275-4601.

Egyptian Community Unit, JoAnna Adams, R.R. No. 1, Tamms, IL 62988, (618) 776-5251.

Elba Central School, Mrs. Viola Stokes School Food Director, 57 South Main, Elba, NY 14058 (716) 757-9967.

Esmeralda Co. School District, Jim Bullock Superintendent, Box 546, Goldfield, NV 89013, (702) 485-6382.

Fredericksburg City Schools, Willie Conyers, Director of Federal Projects, 817 Princess Ann Street, Fredericksburg, VA 22401 (703) 371-0430.

Grace Joint No. 148, Gay Panter, School Food Director, P.O. Box 328, Grace, ID 83241, (208) 425-3920.

Grant Co. Schools, Betty Groves, 204 Jefferson Avenue, Petersburg, WV 26847 (304) 257-1011.

Greenwich Public Schools, Toni West, Food Service Supervisor, 290 Greenwich Avenue, Greenwich, CT 06830 (203) 625-7400.

Humphreys Co. School District, Rebecca Smith, Food Service Coordinator, P.O. Box 766, 1035 Church, Waverly, TN 37185 (615) 296-2568.

Huntington Beach City S.D., Joyce Lareau, School Food Director, P.O. Box 71, Huntington Beach, CA 92648, (714) 964-8888.

Iberville Parrish School Dist., Emmajo Williamson, School Food Supervisor, P.O. Box 151, Plaquemine, LA 70764, (504) 687-7629.

Menahga School District #821, Linda West, Bookkeeper, Menahga, MN 56464, (281) 564-4141.

Monroe County Sch. Dist., Sue Cummins, School Food Director, 242 White Street, P.O. Box 1430, Key West, FL 33040, (305) 296-6523.

Morristown School District, Linda Magoon, Hot Lunch Agent, Morrisville, VT 05661, (802) 888-4541.

Northwestern Local Sch. Distr., Virginia Mitchell, School Food Director, 5610 Troy Road, Springfield, OH 45502, (513) 964-1318.

Norton City Schools, Vic Cardenzana, Business Manager, 4128 Cleveland-Massillon Rd., Norton, OH 44203, (216) 825-0863.

Page Unified Sch. Dist. No. 8, Sue Bender, P.O. Box 1927, Page, AZ 86040, (602) 645-8801.

Reading School District, Murphy Hines, School Food Director, 8th and Washington, Reading, PA 19601, (215) 371-5735.

School Adminis. Dist. No. 6, Judith Percival, School Food Admin. Director, Box 38, Bar Mills, ME 04004, (207) 839-4017.

School District of Lancaster, Gene Miller, School Food Director, 225 W. Orange Street, Lancaster PA 17604 (717) 291-6235.

Shamong Township School Dist., Marilyn Prado, School Board Secretary, Indian Mills School, R.D. 2, Vincentown, NJ 08088, (609) 268-0440.

Tyler Independent Sch. Dist., Judy Richter, School Food Director, P.O. Box 2035, Tyler, TX 75710, (214) 595-3481.

Woodhaven School District, Toni Makarewicz, ARA Representative, 24787 Van Horn Rd., Flat Rock, MI 48134, (313) 782-4700.

Worth County Public Schools, Peggy Harris, School Food Director, 204 East Franklin, P.O. Box 359, Sylvester, GA 31791, (912) 776-6943.

CASH SITES*

Boise School District, Judy Stanton, 1207 Fort, Boise, Idaho 83702.

Doris M. Layman, St. Louis Public Schools, Division of Food Services, 3020 Lexington, St. Louis, Missouri 63115.

Jonesboro Public Schools, Joan Holiday, 1307 S. Flynt, Jonesboro, Arkansas 72401.

Oakland Unified School District, Frances E. McGlone, 900 High Street, Oakland, California 94601.

Dayton Public Schools, Betty Bender, 348 W. First Street, Dayton, Ohio 45402.

*The above five cash site schools have participated in earlier congressionally mandated pilot studies.

CLOC SITES

Alleghany County Sch. Dist., Sam Cook, Administrative Assistant, 330 N. Court Avenue, Covington, VA 24426, (703) 962-3969.

Community School District No. 4, Verne Bear, Superintendent, U.S. Highway 150 & Sulphur Springs Rd., P.O. Box 160, Paris, IL 61944, (217) 465-5391.

Elk Point S.D. #61-3, Dawn Heaton, Kitchen Manager, P.O. Box 578, Elk Point, SD 57025, (605) 356-2606.

Fairfax County Public Schools, Dorothy Vanegmond-Pannell, Director, Food Services, 6707 Electronic Drive, Springfield, VA 22151, (703) 941-1665.

Flowing Wells Schools, Elsie Fuller, School Food Director, 4545 N. Lacholia Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85705, (602) 887-1100.

Fruitland Idaho Pub. Schools, Ben Kerfoot, Superintendent, P.O. Box 387, Fruitland, ID 83619, (208) 452-3360.

Gilroy Unified School District, Janet McCown, Supervisor, 7663 Church Street, Gilroy, CA 95020, (408) 842-8374.

Gonvick-Trail Community School, Don Danielson, Superintendent, 1st at Elm Street, Gonvick, MN 56644, (218) 487-5262.

Green Forest School District, James Johnston, Superintendent, P.O. Drawer AO, Green Forest, AR 72630, (501) 438-5223.

Hernando Co. School District, June Mathews, Food Service Director, 919 Highway 41 North, Brooksville, FL 33512, (94) 796-6761.

Indiana Area School District, Ralph Hegner, School Food Director, 501 East Pike, Indiana, PA 15701, (412) 463-8713.

Knox Co. School District, W.P. Clear, School Food Authority, P.O. Box 2188, Knoxville, TN, 37901, (615) 521-2426.

Lexington School District No. 3, Patricia Holstein, School Food Director, 707 E. Co-

lumbia Avenue, Batesburg, SC 29006, (803) 532-5867.

Longview S.D. No. 122, Terri Anderson, Food Service Manager, 28th and Lilac Streets, Longview, WA 98632, (206) 577-2728.

Loudon County School District, Jean McCall, Food Service Supervisor, P.O. Drawer D, Loudon, TN 37774, (615) 458-6138.

Lyndon Town School District, Sue Montague, Cafeteria Manager, Lyndonville, Elementary School, Lyndonville, VT 05851, (802) 748-4262.

Merrill School District, Robert Opsahl, District Administrative Assistant, 1111 N. Sales Street, Merrill, WI 54452, (715) 536-4581.

Parkersburg Community Schools, Mrs. Camilla Coy, Elementary Secretary, Parkersburg Elementary School, 602 Lincoln, Parkersburg, IA 50665, (319) 346-2446.

Pendleton Co. School Dist., Virgil Puffenburger, Asst. Superintendent, P.O. Box 938, Franklin, WV 26807, (304) 358-2207.

Portland Public Schools, William Verrill, Food Service Director, 28 Homestead Avenue, Portland, ME 04103, (207) 797-5076.

River Falls School District, Carolyn Camp, School Food Administrator, 104 East Locust Street, River Falls, WI 54022, (715) 425-6771.

Shoreline Public Schools No. 412, Connie Hevly, Food Service Supervisor, 17077 Meridian Ave. North, Seattle, WA 98133, (206) 361-4207.

Troy School District, Gayle Moran, Supervisor of Food Services, 4400 Livernois, Troy, MI 48098, (313) 689-7495.

Victoria Indep. Sch. District, Dolores Barnabei, Food Service Director, 102 Profit Drive, Victoria, TX 77901, (512) 576-3131.

Washakie Comm. Con. Sch. Dis. 2, Holly Smothers, Head Cook, Box 115, Ten Sleep, WY 82442, (307) 366-2233.

Waterford Township SD, Ruth Albertson, Cafeteria Manager, Thomas Richards School, 925 Lincoln Ave., Atco, NJ 08004, (609) 768-1473.

Weld Co. Sch. District, Ralph Randel, Supervisor, Food Service, 811 Fifteenth Street, Greeley, CO 80631, (303) 352-1543.

Windsor Public Schools, Rita K. Heimann, School Food Coordinator, 150 Bloomfield Avenue, Windsor, CT 06095, (203) 688-0003.

COMMODITY SITES

Adams Co. Sch. Dist. No. 12, Eunice Anderson, School Food Director, 11285 Highland Drive, North Glen, CO 80233, (303) 451-1561.

Broward County School District, Jane Wynn, Director, School Food Service, 1320 S.W. 4th Street, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312, (305) 765-6242.

Buckeye Local School District, Theresa Besece, School Food Director, P.O. Box 300, Rayland, OH 43943, (614) 598-4160.

Burlington Township SD, Rita Giametro, Business Manager, Box 428, Burlington, NJ 08016, (609) 387-3955.

Castro Valley Unified S.D., Charlie Gibson, Business Director, P.O. Box 2146, Castro Valley, CA 94546, (415) 537-3000.

Dublin Independent Sch. Dist., Jessie Barbee, School Food Service Director, Box 1444, Dublin, GA 31021, (912) 272-3440.

Enfield Public School, Eleanor McDaniel, Director, School Food Service, 27 Shaker Road, Enfield, CT 06082, (203) 745-2609.

Galway Central School District, Margaretha Smith, School Food Director, Galway, NY 12074, (518) 882-1222.

Granite Falls Public Schools, Marie Anderson, School Food Service Director, 450

9th Avenue, Granite Falls, MN 56241, (612) 546-4081.

Hampshire County Schools, Dave C. Trimmer, Director, Federal Programs, Court House Annex, Romney, WV 26757, (304) 822-3098.

Harrisonburg City Schools, Marianne Hinkle, Food Service Director, P.O. Box 551, Harrisonburg, VA 22801, (703) 436-9916.

Hot Springs County No. 1, Doris Ready, School Food Director, 441 Park Street, Thermopolis, WY 82443, (307) 864-2479.

Jefferson Co. School Dist., Faye Grant, School Food Director, 1490 West Washington, Monticello, FL 32344, (904) 997-5852.

Lexington School District No. 4, Jeanette Stabler, School Food Director, Rt. 1, Box 638, North, SC 29112, (803) 779-7373.

Marshall Co. Sch. District, Joy Lewter, Supervisor of Food Service, Lewisburg, TN 37091, (615) 359-6283.

Medical Lake S.D. No. 326, Marion Fisher, Food Service Supervisor, Box 128, Medical Lake, WA 99022, (509) 299-3156.

Mifflin County Public Schs., Maria Griffiths, School Food Director, 514 West 4th Street, Lewistown, PA 10744, (717) 248-0148.

Nogales Unified Sch. Dist. No. 1, Hector Franco, Food Service Manager, 222 Plum Street, Nogales, AZ 85621, (602) 287-5998.

Nye County School District, Mary Taylor, School Food Director, P.O. Box 113, Tonopah, NV 89049, (702) 482-6258.

Parma School District No. 137, Marie Hopkins, Food Service Manager, Box 246, Parma, ID 83660, (208) 722-5115.

Pharr-San Juan Alamo, Manuel Perez, Business Manager, Independent School District, Pharr, TX 78577, (512) 787-6551.

Pleasant Hill Comm. Unit No. 3, Gordon Sansom, Superintendent, Pleasant Hill, IL 62366, (217) 734-2311.

San Diego Unified, Jane M. Boehrer, School Food Director, San Diego Unified, 4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103, (714) 293-8091.

School Adminis. Dist. No. 54, June Bichard, Food Service Supervisor, P.O. Box 69, Skowhegan, ME 04976, (207) 474-2497.

Smackover School District, Bob Hood, Superintendent, Route 1, Box 123-B, Smackover, AR 71762, (501) 725-3132.

St. Bernard Parrish Sch. Dist., Les Scharfenstein, School Food Director, Chalmette Circle and LaCaste, Chalmette, LA 70043, (504) 279-9451.

Sully Buttes S.D. No. 58-2, Dennis R. Sharp, Business Manager, General Delivery, Onida, SD 57564, (605) 258-2619.

Twinfield Union No. 33, Raeleen Wright, Lunch Program Director, Plainfield, VT 05667, (802) 426-3245.

Union City School District, Ruth Matson, School Food Director, 430 St. Joseph Street, Union City, MI 49094, (517) 741-8091.

Urbana Community School, Bev Kisling, Secretary to the Superintendent, Box 246, Urbana, IA 52345, (319) 443-2426.

Washoe County School District, Frank Towers, Director, Food Service, 425 East Ninth Street, Reno, NV 89520, (702) 322-7041.

Westby Public Schools, Dan Wiegand, Administrator, 206 W. Avenue South, Westby, WI 54667, (608) 634-3101.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few comments on H.R. 1728,

a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide for limited extension of alternative means of providing assistance under the School Lunch Program.

H.R. 1728 would extend through fiscal year 1992 pilot projects in 64 school districts across the country. These pilot projects allow schools to receive either cash payments or commodity letters of credit [CLOC] instead of the surplus commodities from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

While I will vote for final passage of this bill, I am concerned about extending these pilot projects through fiscal year 1992. These projects were first authorized in the 1981 agriculture appropriations bill. Then in 1985, the Food Security Act—Public Law 99-198—extended these pilot projects through June 30, 1987. After a decade, it seems to me that a pilot project becomes an ongoing program. On the other hand, a precipitous cancellation of these projects would disrupt the ongoing food service operations in these school districts.

Furthermore, I understand why these pilot projects came into existence. Last month, the Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition, which I have the honor to chair, held a hearing on a bill, H.R. 1340. This bill would improve the distribution of surplus commodities acquired by the Department of Agriculture. Three statutes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture authorize the distribution of surplus commodities to schools and other nonprofit organizations. These authorities are section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, section 32 amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935, and section 404 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The testimony from representatives of institutions that receive the surplus commodities made it clear that the commodity distribution program is badly in need of repair. Too often, the commodities are received late by recipient agencies and in forms which are difficult to use. We heard about cheese that doesn't melt and beef shipments which come so late in the academic year that schools have to store hamburger over the summer.

The subcommittee intends to mark up H.R. 1340 tomorrow so that we can insure that the commodity distribution program fulfills its two statutory objectives:

Removal of surplus agricultural commodities from the market.

Nutrition assistance to schools and senior citizens centers.

H.R. 1340 incorporates a series of recommendations forwarded to the Department of Agriculture on March 26, 1986, by the American School Food Service Association and the American

Frozen Food Association. H.R. 1340 embodies these recommendations and has been endorsed by a coalition of more than 25 general farm and commodity organizations.

I am confident that enactment of H.R. 1340 this year will insure that we will not have to perpetuate these pilot projects beyond the period established in H.R. 1728 which we are considering today because the Commodity Distribution Program will be improved to serve both the agricultural sector and our schools and other recipient institutions.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1728, a bill to extend the existing cash and commodity letter of credit school lunch projects, through June 30, 1992.

Basically, this legislation maintains the status quo for those 64 school districts who are currently operating either a cash or commodity letter of credit alternative program. I am pleased that two school districts in my State of Vermont, the Lyndon Town School District and the Morristown School District, were chosen to participate in this demonstration of alternatives to commodities.

H.R. 1728 does not extend the cash or commodity letter of credit option to any additional school districts.

I believe that we should extend the authority of these 64 pilot sites to continue their programs for a reasonable time period and I think that the bill under consideration today provides for such an extension. This will enable the various congressional committees which have a strong interest in both our federally assisted feeding and commodity programs to take a long hard look at how we can best improve the current commodity donation program. Moreover, it gives us adequate time to review the cash and commodity letter of credit experiences.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in moving to suspend the rules and approve this modest amendment to the National School Lunch Act.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering H.R. 1728, which extends the Alternatives to Commodities Program established by Congress in 1981 for 5 years. I am pleased to be able to report to my colleagues that this program, which has been used in 66 school districts across the Nation—including the Shoreline Public School District in my own district of Washington State—has resulted in higher quality school lunches and more variety in student meals at reduced cost.

The program provides vouchers, known as commodity letters of credit [CLOC's], or cash which are used to buy food supplies locally. This permits greater flexibility in managing school lunch programs and provides students with fresher foods while reducing storage and transportation costs.

This measure extends the program through 1992, which will provide additional experience with the alternate programs, as well as time to consider changes in the traditional Commodity Donation Program to increase the support it provides for the School Lunch Program, as we continue to search for ways to improve the

commodities program and make it more cost effective.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to lend their support to H.R. 1728. The alternatives are good programs, the school lunch managers find them effective, and the students receive better meals because they are available.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that I may include the text of an article concerning the Commodity Letter of Credit Program in the RECORD following my remarks.

FOOD SERVICE—AN ALTERNATIVE TO COMMODITIES

(By Constance Hevly, R.D.)

At a time when the National School Lunch program continues to face a severe challenge to its federal support, school districts must take advantage of every way possible to economize. Sixty-four school districts which tested two different alternatives to the current system concluded that the USDA Commodity Program, established in 1936, has become outdated and overly costly to school districts. They have found that there is a better way that still fulfills the purpose of the Commodity Donation Program to support farm prices and to safeguard the health and well-being of the nation's children by meeting their nutritional needs.

The two alternatives to commodities that have been tried are cash and Commodity Letter of Credit (CLOC). There were two previous pilot programs using cash. In total, 40 districts plus the entire state of Kansas receive cash (35 of those districts were involved in this study) and 31 districts receive CLOC funds.

Those districts receiving cash can use it whenever and for whatever food they want to buy for the school lunch program. Those districts receiving CLOCs (vouchers given for a specific amount of money designated for generic types of food, e.g. beef, chicken, turkey, potatoes, grains and oil products) must spend them at the same time the USDA is making these purchases.

The cash sites definitely preferred receiving cash to commodities, but this option did not relieve surpluses of specific farm products or meet price support goals, which CLOCs did. Cash sites agreed that if there was to be any hope for a nationwide local option of an alternative to commodities, it would have to incorporate a price support mechanism. They could certainly "live with" the CLOC option and would do so rather than return to commodities.

For the last four years, the CLOC sites in this pilot study have demonstrated that the CLOC program has worked in every size school district (from very small to very large) and in every region of the United States. Approximately 70 percent of the food used by the school lunch program is purchased locally. They demonstrated that the remaining 30 percent received in the form of commodities can also be purchased locally.

By far, the greatest savings can be made by the local purchase of all bonus commodities. (I could have used 1½ times more dairy products by using my dairy money to buy cottage cheese, cream cheese, swiss cheese, yogurt, jack cheese, sour cream, ice cream and milk for the students, as well as the butter, cheese and dried milk that the government sends.) Bonus commodities are available in whatever amount can be used without wasting them. However, at this time, those of us participating in the study

are only asking that we receive CLOC funds for entitlement commodities.

We took our plea to the U.S. House of Representative's Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education on May 15, 1986. We reported that the study report and news release issued by the USDA was misleading and did not fully describe the results of the findings.

The USDA said that the commodity program now in place works better than the alternatives. It may work better for the USDA, but the CLOC alternative still met all of the farm support objectives and worked much better for the school districts.

Test sites found that CLOC districts:

- Saved the cost of frozen food storage;
- Saved freight expense for commodities;
- Saved warehouse labor costs;
- Saved kitchen labor costs—used less labor-intensive foods;

- Increased patronage because food was purchased in a form the children prefer;

- Reduced plate waste—if they don't eat it, it doesn't meet their nutritional needs;

- Were able to coordinate deliveries with menus;

- Had food costs as low as or lower than the value shown by the USDA;

- Contributed to the local economy;

- Relieved the federal government of the cost and responsibility to purchase, store and distribute surplus food;

- Were able to utilize more fresh fruits and vegetables;

- Eliminated money tied up in food products in a warehouse until it can be used—local vendors deliver to the door in specified quantities on a predictable schedule at competitive prices;

- Stimulated local competition among vendors;

- Had the ability to trade CLOCs over the phone nationwide before purchases were made, thus allowing for local preferences;

- Received more usable commodities;

- Were able to serve food purchased with CLOC funds before commodity schools were even notified they were going to receive it in some cases.

The USDA stated that the present commodity program provides significantly more food to the School Lunch Program. This is not an advantage to the district if it sits in the warehouse because the kids won't eat it; or participation drops because the kids won't buy it and the children on free and reduced-paying lunches throw it in the garbage can.

The USDA stated that the present commodity program provides foods that tend to have less salt. Study sites were not required to record sodium added to recipes in any form (salt, soup bases, etc.).

The American School Food Service Association and the National Frozen Food Association Ad Hoc Commodity Program Study Group entered into a joint resolution that stated that both organizations would continue to support the USDA Commodity Distribution Program until July 1987, but to eliminate further erosion of this support, a concerted effort must be made to correct the deficiencies and seek improvements of the current commodity distribution program. A list of 20 deficiencies and improvements was recommended. If, at the end of this period, USDA has not implemented these recommendations satisfactorily, legislation should be introduced to offer a workable CLOC option to all states.

The study sites do not intend to wait until June 1987, to see if the USDA has answered these 20 issues. We have organized an Asso-

ciation of Schools for an Alternative to Commodities. Our short-term goal is to make CLOC a permanent option for entitlement commodities for CLOC and cash sites. (As long as we are on the option, we keep it an open issue.) Our long-term goal is to make CLOC an option nationwide at the local level (not at the state level).

Any school district employee interested in furthering the goals of this group can request information from: Janet McGowan, Membership Chairman, Association of Schools for an Alternative to Commodities, Gilroy Unified School District, Gilroy, CA 95020.

We truly care about the future of the Child Nutrition program. The CLOC option works and it particularly benefits schools at the district level. We believe it can help prevent pricing ourselves out of business.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1728.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1320

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moorhead].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE CONGRESS SHOULD BE PREPARED TO USE JACKSON-VANIK AMENDMENT TO OPEN TRADE WITH THE SOVIET UNION AND ENCOURAGE MORE EMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, change seems to be underway in the Soviet Union in their treatment of dissidents, refuseniks, and Jewish people seeking to leave Russia. Whether this change is lasting—or just a brief spring thaw—remains to be seen.

But the limited news to date is very encouraging.

I would like to commend the National Conference on Soviet Jewry and Mr. Morris B. Abram for their statement of April 1, commenting on the new developments—and for listing some of the improvements they expect to see in coming months. The statement notes:

After further consultation within the Jewish community, and with members of Congress and government leaders, Mr. Bronfman and Mr. Abram would be prepared to suggest incremental responses based on measured progress on the above-mentioned points. Under consideration would be support for a change in the Stevenson Amendment, as well as annual waivers of the trade restrictions in the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, based on very substantial and sustained emigration. Only annual waivers will be considered until the problem of Soviet Jewish emigration has been completely resolved.

I would just like to state, Mr. Speaker, as one member of the Ways and Means Committee that I would welcome the day when we could use the Jackson-Vanik amendment to respond to "substantial and sustained emigration."

I also note that the Atlantic Council has just urged most-favored-nation status for the U.S.S.R. without the emigration "linkage" of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. I disagree. Trade with even our allies is not very popular these days. Trade with a persistent adversary has even less support. Use of Jackson-Vanik—the quid pro quo—is absolutely essential for the development of support for trade relations with the Soviets. Those who seek to improve relations with the Soviets should try to use Jackson-Vanik, not repeal it.

We also need to signal to the Soviets what "substantial and sustained emigration" means. The Soviets must feel like the greyhound in the racetrack chasing the mechanical rabbit. The rabbit is always beyond reach and in the end is snatched away. Twice before, emigration levels soared, and the United States did not extend MFN. If they soar again, it would be wise to be serious about the carrot of MFN.

The Reagan administration has failed woefully to negotiate with the Soviets. If we can't even negotiate with them on trade issues, how can we hope for agreements on security and arms? I hope, I pray that the small thaw on human rights cases which has occurred in recent days will be the beginning of a chance to negotiate trade agreements with the Soviets—and these agreements can point the way to overall better relations.

THE GULF OF MEXICO MARINE AND COASTAL RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to address the serious problem of coastal wetland erosion in Louisiana and to protect our Gulf of Mexico marine and coastal resources.

While broad legislation, which I support, has already been introduced in an attempt to address the loss of our Nation's coastal wetlands, I believe the legislation I am introducing today is critical to the national debate on this issue if Congress is to develop a final bill that represents a fair and realistic solution to this entire issue.

The specific legislative solution that I am proposing is necessary because the loss of Louisiana coastal wetlands represents approximately 80 percent of the total national coastal wetlands loss.

Louisiana's coastal wetlands are eroding at a rate estimated to be 60 square miles per year.

Since 1900, Louisiana has lost over 1,700 square miles of coastal wetlands, an area one and one-third times the size of Rhode Island! Unless these losses are reversed, the remaining Louisiana coastal wetlands will disappear in our lifetime!

If this is allowed to occur, this Nation will lose one of the most productive ecosystems, in the world that produces 27 percent of our Nation's annual commercial seafood harvest. At least 98 percent of the entire Gulf of Mexico's commercial fisheries species and 75 percent of the volume of the commercial seafood harvest spend part of their life cycle in Louisiana's coastal wetlands. These wetlands also produce 40 percent of the animals supporting our Nation's fur industry, and they represent the southern end of the national Mississippi flyway, which constitutes a vital habitat for the breeding, wintering and migration of wild birds and waterfowl.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have introduced addresses the Louisiana coastal wetlands loss problem; and it protects our Gulf of Mexico marine and coastal resources at the site of the highest concentration of damage. Indeed, it is a very real national emergency. Just as Congress has recognized and begun to address the unique regional problems of the Chesapeake Bay and its impact on the Atlantic coast, it is likewise imperative that we do not ignore the Louisiana coastal wetlands problem and its significant impact on the Gulf of Mexico region and this Nation.

This legislation, the Gulf of Mexico Marine and Coastal Resources Protection Act, authorizes the creation of a commission consisting of key Federal, State, and local representatives who will provide directly to Congress within 2 years a specific and compre-

hensive action plan to reduce the loss of Louisiana coastal wetlands and return these wetlands to a natural and productive state. In doing so we will also protect the marine resources of the entire Gulf of Mexico.

This commission will provide, for the first time, a coordinated policy and action plan for dealing with wetlands loss. The commission's existence is authorized for 15 years to monitor the implementation of the action plan once it is developed. Such sums as necessary are authorized for fiscal years 1987 through 1989 for the commission to develop the action plan and conduct its duties. Funding for projects to be recommended in the action plan has not been authorized in this bill. While it is certain that the protection of our wetlands will not come cheaply, it would be premature to set funding authorization levels that could be inaccurate for projects for which technical and engineering requirements and cost estimates will not be available until the action plan is submitted to Congress. However, this legislation does authorize cost sharing levels for these future projects. The costs of implementing projects included in the final action plan would be funded on a cost sharing basis, with the Federal Government paying 75 percent of the costs and non-Federal interests paying 25 percent.

Commission members include: two cochairmen, the Secretary of the Army for Civil Works and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce; the chairman of the Gulf of Mexico Marine Fisheries Council; State of Louisiana department leaders with jurisdiction over wetlands; representatives from the commercial and sports fisheries industries, hunters' associations, landowners' associations, and environmental groups in Louisiana; and, as an advisory committee to the commission, the Governors of Gulf of Mexico coastal States. The commission's broad representation at the Federal, State, and local levels is the only way to develop an effective policy for dealing with wetlands erosion along the Louisiana coastline, and, ultimately, the rest of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also directs the commission to analyze and consider some specific but controversial solutions in developing a final action plan to revitalize our coastal wetlands. The magnitude of the wetlands erosion problem demands that we seriously consider all of these solutions and more. However, the commission's broad representation as well as a public comment period on the action plan will ensure that every possible solution, from freshwater/sediment diversion to water control structures, will be developed and addressed in an equitable manner.

Finally, this legislation also specifically addresses the national policies that have caused our coastal wetlands loss. By including such specifics in the bill, I merely want to emphasize to my colleagues that these important national policies and activities, which many in Congress—including myself—have supported in the best interest of our citizens, are also responsible for most of our wetlands erosion.

Therefore, it is only equitable that we take further and more specific action on the Federal level and in Congress to address the serious problem of wetlands erosion. Though our efforts have increased over the years, there is still no coordination at all levels of government, nor is there a coordinated and comprehensive policy to address this wetlands issue. With this legislation, Congress can take immediate action to set as well as coordinate wetlands policy for our Nation's largest and most severely impacted area and subsequently apply this policy to the remainder of the Nation's coastal wetland areas.

I urge my colleagues in Congress to support this legislation in concert with other initiatives that address our Nation's serious wetlands erosion problem.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 93, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL 1988

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-42) on the resolution (H. Res. 139) providing for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, we will begin this week to discuss the budget. But the discussion may be a little one-sided because we will have before us a budget that the majority of the Budget Committee has put forward. That will be a budget that reflects the views of the Democratic members of the Budget Committee because the Republican members voted against it.

We will also have before us a budget submitted by the President of the United States. That budget, apparently, has not yet come to the attention of the Republican Members. At least to my knowledge, as of today, no Re-

publican Member had come forward urging that he or she be allowed to offer that budget as a document which this House would adopt.

So we have the majority budget that came forward. We have the "orphan budget," sent up here by the President and promptly abandoned by the President's party. Then we have, or we thought we would have, the budget that represents the viewpoint of the Republican Members.

My understanding is that the budget does not exist. Perhaps I am wrong, and I would hope I would be wrong because I would like to see the budget process go forward in a reasonable way in which we would choose among the President's budget, the budget put forward by the Budget Committee, and the budget representing the wishes of the minority.

The minority has apparently up to now decided, at least they did not present anything in the Budget Committee and I am told they had not yet presented anything to the Rules Committee, and if I am wrong, I will be glad to stipulate to that; but my understanding is that we will have no Republican budget. That what we are basically being told by their actions is that since they are in the minority and they have no responsibility for producing the budget, they will appropriately act irresponsibly.

I will congratulate my Republican colleagues because they are showing themselves to be very well equipped to discharge the function of a minority. I assume by this performance it will further persuade people that minority status is very much something for them to continue with.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman aware of the fact that the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, Mr. LATTI, requested the Rules Committee to allow him to offer a package of amendments to the underlying budget, including the requirement that whatever numbers are adopted by the House be in fact numbers that will be accepted or actually work in the House. That is, they will be automatic reconciliation numbers, but on a party-line vote was denied the opportunity to even offer those amendments to the floor?

Mr. FRANK. I am aware that the gentleman had some amendments to the rules that he wanted to offer which I had been advised were of dubious germaneness, but I am not aware that the gentleman wanted to present an alternative budget. If he had wanted to present an alternative

budget, there would not have been any objection.

He wanted to include in that a series of changes in the rules. Now, we voted on the rules once, we could vote on the rules again, but I think what the gentleman wanted to do was to avoid having to come forward with a budget because we do have this problem. We have a budget that the President sent. No Republican Member of the House, to my knowledge, has said, "Let us have a vote on the President's budget." We will have a vote on the President's budget, over, I think, the implicit objection of Members on the other side because they do not want to touch the President's budget. Then we ask for a budget on the other side. What we got, I am told, from the gentleman from Ohio were a series of amendments that dealt with the budget process. That is not what we are dealing with here today.

Mr. LUNGREN. If the gentleman will yield, the part of the budget process, as you refer to it, is a requirement that if we adopt the Democratic budget on the floor of the House, the numbers contained in the Democratic budget will in fact be binding on this House. They will, in fact, act as an automatic reconciliation.

What his amendment said is if we are serious about the budget process, if those on your side of the aisle want to bring forward a budget and claim that that is going to be the business of this House, then we should accept it at the end and say, "We will be driven by those numbers." That is what you call a change in the process.

That is what we call trying to be honest with the process and we were denied the opportunity to allow that even to be considered on the floor of the House.

Mr. FRANK. As the gentleman knows, there were opportunities to consider those things in the rules when we adopted the rules. Yes, it is a change in the process because we have the process of reconciliation. That is a statute; it gets voted on by both Houses and the President gets to sign it.

What the gentleman is trying to do here is what the Republican Party has been trying to do for the past month; Avoid having to come up with a budget. Where is your budget? What we are talking about now is the absence of a Republican budget. When we had the meeting of the Budget Committee originally and the chairman said, "Look, we are just going to start with a freeze and we will amend from there because none of us really want a straight freeze," the Republicans said, "We cannot participate; there is no Democratic budget." They refused to participate. They sent a letter like SDS: Here are our demands.

When that did not happen, then the Democrats voted on the budget and

the Republicans having said, "We are upset because you have not produced one," then they were upset because they had produced one. There will be talk about procedures; issues that were voted on before. There will be talk about a whole lot of things. The Republican Party will neither embrace the President's budget, and I do not blame them for that; it is a dog, and the Republicans' unwillingness to support their own President's budget shows some survival instinct, which I applaud.

But neither will they give us their budget.

Mr. LUNGREN. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has described a scenario which, to those listening, would sound to be a reasonable scenario, but in point of fact as the gentleman knows, Members on our side of the aisle were kept in the dark with respect to the preparation of the budget that came out of the committee.

Mr. FRANK. Was the gentleman also kept in the dark about the budget that came out of the Office of Management and Budget signed Ronald Reagan? A budget came from the President of the United States in January. You have got at your disposal, you on the Republican side, the executive branch apparatus. You have OMB. Why were you not able to come up with a budget working with them?

□ 1330

Were you kept in the dark by OMB? Why will you not support the President's budget?

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. The gentleman said why have we not come out with a budget, working with them? The House of Representatives means we work with one another; supposedly, it means Members on both sides of the aisle.

Members on our side of the aisle were denied the opportunity to work with Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle in coming up with a budget for the House of Representatives.

We wanted to act in concert, as the chairman of the Budget Committee claimed he wanted to; yet Members on this side of the aisle were frozen out of the process considering the President's budget or any budget whatsoever. For months we were frozen out of the process, not only as to the numbers, but everything.

Mr. FRANK. I have to take back my time, because that is simply flatly inaccurate.

Mr. LUNGREN. No; it is not.

Mr. FRANK. Does the gentleman remember reading in the paper, I was not there, but no one denied it, the chairman of the Budget Committee

opened up the budget process and said, "OK, any amendments? Do you want to make any changes?"

The Republican Party refused to participate. They voted "present."

The fact is that when asked to participate, they said, "no."

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I will yield in a minute to the gentleman, and I am glad to yield. In a minute I will yield to the gentleman; but I also want to point out the extraordinary remark the gentleman from California just made.

I said, understand the scenario. We have no House Republican budget. They did not come up with one. They came up with some rules changes, but no budget, because it is a difficult time we are in now, meeting Gramm-Rudman targets, trying to reduce the deficit; those are difficult things to do.

The President tried. I do not think he was very successful, but he tried. The House Budget Committee tried.

The minority party, using the prerogatives of the minority to be literally irresponsible, not responsible for what happened, will not even come up with a budget at all.

Now, what are their excuses? "Well, the Democrats wouldn't share with us."

You have got OMB that would have supplied the information.

The gentleman from California says, "Oh, no, we can't cooperate with the administration in coming up with legislation. We must cooperate with our fellow Members of the House."

I do not think that is a serious statement.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. Not yet, not yet.

The fact is that in the 6-plus years that I have been here it is frequent for Members of the Republican side to work with their administration in coming up with legislation. The notion that because the House Budget Committee chairman did not throw open his books to them, they could not work with their own OMB in coming up with a budget, shows how unserious they are.

The fact is that they did not want to try to come up with a budget because it would be too tough.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Florida, who had asked me first.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to make a comment relative to the gentleman's statement about being offered the opportunity to offer amendments.

I would say to the gentleman that there was one page in front of us indicating a series of numbers, no backup material whatsoever, no indication about what their plan was. There was no ability really to make a serious

fer about what an amendment would be.

Mr. FRANK. Oh, I regard that as simply an evasion of responsibility. The Republican Party has the vastest budget apparatus available that anybody has, the executive branch, OMB. They have avoided scrupulously putting forward a budget because they cannot come up with one.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida, I think, knows better. When we started the debate in the Budget Committee, the gentleman right next to me and offered an "I may freeze, for example, in the defense function 050."

Mr. MACK. That was not a serious offer on the budget.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I have yielded to the gentleman from Illinois, would like to point out.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for regular order. I will do this in an orderly process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAY of Illinois). Regular order will be maintained. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the time. He has yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

A series of amendments were offered. The gentleman from Florida and his colleagues on the Republican side had ample opportunity to either increase or to decrease the amount of money on defense spending. I think that the people listen and all those in the Chamber should be aware of the fact that in every single instance, without fail, every Member of the Republican side voted "present," not to increase by a penny, not to decrease by a penny, any defense spending.

You cannot really take it both ways, gentlemen. You have to really take a position and stand by it.

When it came time for the Democratic budget proposal, your ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI) was again asked whether he had amendments to offer to the Democratic budget resolution, and none were offered; so to suggest that you were not allowed to be part of the process I do not believe is accurate.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I just want to stress again what the Republican Party is doing. They are trying every sort of smoke screen to cover up the fact that they do not have a budget. We will meet tomorrow and there will not be a budget that they put forward.

The President had a budget. They do not like it and they will not come up with one themselves. They would rather criticize others.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution process to work effectively has to be a process where we make choices, very tough choices. We are at the point in the budget resolution dealing with a deficit where there are only so many choices left to be made, whether we do it through defense or whether we do it on the domestic side or whether we do it through taxes or whether we do a combination of all three of them; but you have got to make a choice. Which way are you going to go in order to reduce the deficit? It is not going to go away by magic. It is not going to go away by putting your heads in the sand.

The problem is that you have not made a choice. What is being presented here in the resolution is a choice. They are tough ones. They are not easy, but at least it is a choice to try to deal with the deficit issue.

What you are choosing to do is not make a choice and to try to run and hide from that.

You cannot use the argument about the committee. We all know that the budget is out there. The President presents a budget. You have members of the Budget Committee who are very familiar with the budget resolution process and can develop a budget resolution. We have had alternatives presented here in the past, so that is the point. The point is, are you willing to make some tough choices? Now is the time to do it.

On the budget process issue, let me say that I agree with many Members who have raised issues regarding the budget process. There are some changes that need to be made, whether it is going to a 2-year budget or trying to modify Gramm-Rudman or tighten up on the various rules that we have to make it enforceable; but you also know this is not the place to do it. We have never in the debates over the budget resolution changed the process at the same time we were dealing with the budget resolution, never.

Now, if you want to deal with budget process reforms, there is a time to do that and I am willing to sit down with Members from the other side to try to develop that kind of approach at the appropriate time; but the time this week is to debate the choices in the budget resolution and that is what we ought to target.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I understand why perhaps what the gentleman has said, there may be some confusion, because my understanding is the gentleman is not on the Budget Committee and the gentleman is going by written reports that he has seen.

The fact is that the President did submit a budget and it met the \$108 billion Gramm-Rudman requirement.

The fact is that we do not always agree with the President on everything. That has been evident in the past.

The interesting thing to me, though, is that after beating up on the President's budget for all these months, lo and behold, the economic assumptions of the President's budget have been incorporated in the majority proposal.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I take back my time just to ask the gentleman, does the gentleman agree or disagree with those economic assumptions?

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Pardon me?

Mr. FRANK. Does the gentleman agree or disagree with the President's economic assumptions?

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Well, I think they are accurate, but after hearing the other side beat up on the President for all these weeks, it is interesting to me that they would suddenly adopt them.

The point I want to make is that the budget that was submitted by the majority is not a budget. It is a couple sheets of paper. It has no detail. If the President had submitted a budget like that, he would have been chased out of town. It is no budget. It does nothing; but we wanted to work with it.

There is a 2-to-1 majority in the Budget Committee, but we cannot put together a budget under these circumstances.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I have to take back my time because we are being told something now that I think is literally incredible, that the Republican Party, with its own staff resources and with the willing cooperation of the executive branch, the Office of Management and Budget and all the agencies, cannot come up with a budget on its own. If the Democratic Budget Committee does not adopt the procedures it likes, then the Republican minority in this House will not come up with a budget. That is not the reason they did not come up with a budget. They did not come up with a budget because, as the gentleman from California has said, it is too hard. They do not want to come up and confront the reality of the defense problem, of the revenue estimates, of the cuts.

The President's budget, I understand why the Republican Members are not for it, it cuts far too deeply. Older people get hurt in medical care. Students get hurt in the area of education.

The Democratic budget does this a different way. It mitigates those cuts. It makes greater cuts elsewhere.

The President's budget is at least there, however.

The gentleman says, well, the Democratic budget is only two pages. That is two pages longer than the Republican budget.

The fact is that the minority—I have been here when the minority has brought out bills that differed with the majority. Gramm-Latta that every Republican Member who was here at the time, but two, voted for; they did not need the Democratic Budget Committee for Gramm-Latta. They did not need it for other packages they put forward.

The notion that the minority cannot prepare a budget because the majority would not let them is nonsense. They did not want to prepare a budget because it would have imposed on them choices that were too difficult.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think there is another element that should be brought out here and that is the fact that the minority party had the opportunity of choosing between a press release and the process. They chose the press release.

The Republican conference adopted a resolution by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Mack] who was on the floor earlier which literally painted the gentleman's party into an impossible position. They were in a corner they could not escape from. Once they said they would hit the \$108 billion Gramm-Rudman target and not touch taxes, they found themselves in an impossible position. At that point they bailed out. At that point their party really did not involve itself in the budget process, either within the Budget Committee or on its own outside of that committee.

I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts. You have all the resources at your disposal. You do not need to be given facts by the Democrats on the Budget Committee to construct your own priorities, your own standards, and your own spending levels. In fact, you have decided to opt out of the process. I think that is rather transparent and in the coming days as we debate that budget resolution, we have a budget. In fact, the minority party, the Republicans, have none.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman yields sufficient time to me to reply to all these things so we can have some sort of dialog instead of just one statement on this side.

Mr. FRANK. Well, I have yielded about five times already on the gentleman's side and I will continue to do that.

Mr. LUNGREN. I would just say that we have to recognize where we are coming from on this. First of all, as someone said, although it was belittled on that side of the aisle, the numbers on the Budget Committee suggest very, very clearly, that the other side dominates and can get whatever they want out of it.

□ 1340

At the beginning of this year there was the suggestion made by the chairman of the Budget Committee that he wanted to work on a bipartisan basis to come up with a bipartisan budget. Some of us took him at his word on that and thought that that was going to be the case.

Unfortunately, when I contacted the Budget Committee, when they announced that they were going to have hearings, to suggest a small thing, but nonetheless one that might mean up to a billion dollars or several billion dollars in a couple of years—indexing of bonds as a way to look at how we finance the debt that we do have—I was told by the Budget Committee staff that the hearings were not for that. The hearings around the country were to find out what the criticisms were of the President's budget. I was never given an opportunity to present that particular idea, first.

Second, in speaking to some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle who are on the Budget Committee, they were frozen out of the action. They were not given an opportunity to participate in the development of a budget.

The gentleman is correct—we can bring up any budget that we want. But if we want a budget that is going to pass on this floor and really actually make law here, we have to work on the gentleman's side of the aisle. When we were told basically that there is not going to be any spirit of cooperation, we are going to be frozen out of it, you know, that sends a different signal.

The other thing that I would say is that the gentleman keeps talking about all the resources at our disposal, but he never likes to talk about the tremendous disparity between the resources at our disposal here in the House vis-a-vis the Democrats. Maybe that is not significant.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time just to correct a misstatement, because I anticipated the misstatements, I said that you had access to the Office of Management and Budget, as the gentleman well knows. It is his party's administration there.

Yes, there are more Democratic budget staffers than Republican budget staffers in the House, but there is the Office of Management

and Budget and the budget apparatuses of all of the Departments, which I thought were at your disposal.

Maybe the President said, "Either you'll support my budget," which none of you want to do, and I understand that, or he would not help you. But that is the problem, OK. But I did not say that there was an evenness of resources here. I said that given the administration, you could if you wanted to avail yourselves of that, have the resources.

You did not want to come up with a budget. The notion that it had to be bipartisan or you could not do it belie what has happened in this House on a number of occasions. When there are differences of opinion, sometimes we can work together when there are agreements. Sometimes there are differences of opinion and both sides have a responsibility to present to the American people, "Here's our version here's their version, which is the one that people prefer?"

The budget got too tough this year and the Republicans did not want to make a choice.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, one of the points that I tried to make is, was trying to make a meaningful, thought, suggestion on how we can at least bring down the deficit with respect to the financing of the debt that we do have. I was told that the Budget Committee was not interested in that and they were never interested in that.

If the gentleman suggests that we opted out of the budget process when we were told by the committee staff that it was not even of interest to them to take a look at something that might save us over a billion dollars a year, I realize that we are talking about tens of billions, it does not suggest that there was a spirit of cooperation on the gentleman's side of the aisle, and to blame us for opting out after we were denied an opportunity to participate frankly I do not think fair.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the record. I do not blame the Republicans for opting out, I blame them for chickening out, because when they did was to chicken out on the responsibility to say, "Here's our budget."

Yes, the Democrats said, "We've got the majority, and we're going to vote our side, and you can vote your side." I am not saying that the Democrats agreed to let you write the budget. What I am saying is that you refused the opportunity, I think the obligation, to say, "We disagree with the President's budget"—which you all did most of you. Maybe you have the votes over there; we will see. "I did

agree with the Democratic budget, and our budget, we're for none of the above." Because that is what you are putting forward.

You are using all of this procedural lust to avoid the responsibility to present a budget.

Mr. MacKAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MacKAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make the point that when my colleagues on the minority side says that his process was not bipartisan, there are some days when that was absolutely correct, and when our side says that it was partisan, there are some days when that was correct.

My perspective is slightly different, in that some of my priorities in the budget would have been closer to the priorities on the minority side, and I went to the leadership of the Budget Committee and said, "Now I want to make it clear, when we go out there on the day when we are going to try to do a bipartisan, I want to make it clear. Is this a straight deal, or do we have to make a party-line vote?"

I was told, "Absolutely not, you can vote any way you want to."

The day we were to do it bipartisan I was there prepared to make amendments and prepared to vote with Republicans on amendments, and that was the day the Republican Party voted "present."

So if we are all going to start talking about, "The process didn't work right," I think that we ought to acknowledge that every one of us was to blame, and the day we could have one it was the day that, for reasons unbeknownst to me, and which I consider to be legitimate, and I am not criticizing, was the day that the minority and their colleagues voted present."

Unfortunately that was the day when I had negotiated to get my amendments, which I think would have been better and would have been supported by the minority, and I never got a chance to offer them.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee. I apologize for displacing him geographically. It is only a couple of States; from Massachusetts they kind of blur.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. It is a long ways—Tennessee.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just set it straight, and I think that the gentleman from Florida came into this budget process with good intentions, and unfortunately I do not believe that he was in a majority on his side.

Mr. FRANK. I wonder, was the gentleman corrupted, do you think?

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Do I what?

Mr. FRANK. I mean, you said that the gentleman came in with good intentions. I was wondering if he was corrupted somehow.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. He was just outvoted.

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask my question, you know, we talk about profiles in squishiness. In terms of the budget that we are going to be operating on in this House tomorrow, it is not really a budget.

Would the gentleman answer this question: The proposal, the chairman's mark, as I understand it, the first mark that the chairman proposed, was a freeze. If that freeze had been adopted, it is my understanding that Social Security would not have had a COLA increase, veterans would not have received a COLA increase, but was that the starting point? Is that what the Democrats—

Mr. FRANK. I want to respond to that, because I frankly do not think that it rises to the level of seriousness that we ought to have here.

No one that I know of was for a freeze. What the chairman said, as the gentleman well knows, and I think frankly the effort to cover up the fact that there is no Republican budget is deteriorating a little, the chairman said that we will start from here and amend that.

No one was ever for freezing Social Security in that Budget Committee process. The proposal was, "We will start so we will see what it would have looked like if you had a freeze, and we will add or subtract from there."

Mr. MacKAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MacKAY. Mr. Speaker, I can clear up that specific point. I am part of a group which is a moderate-to-conservative group, and I think has a counterpart in the Republican Party that has advocated freeze and pay as you go. In order to do that, you have to start putting in what you want, and as you put it in, you decide how you are going to pay for it.

Mr. FRANK. I would like to take back my time to stress again what is being talked about. The chairman talked about a freeze as one way, about a month ago, of beginning the process, in the absence of a Republican budget that is now wholly inaccurately being attributed to the chairman as a position that he accepted.

We go back to the point. There are tough choices to be made. The President's budget is terribly tough on old people in the medical area. It is very tough on students. It makes a joke out of his talk about competitiveness as it dismantles some of the very programs that he pretends to be for. It cuts

money that we said we were going to use to fight drugs.

The Democratic budget restores some of them by making some cuts elsewhere. The Republicans have no budget. What they are saying is, "Meeting the \$108 billion of Gramm-Rudman, while maintaining our commitment to a defense-spending increase, is so difficult that we are not going to try. We are not even going to put one forward."

The Congressional Black Caucus, I am told, has once again come up with a budget. Presumably they have even fewer staff people at their command than does the Republican Party.

□ 1350

The Republican Party will not have a budget, and I stress this because as we face debate on this budget this week, people should be clear that we have the President's budget and the Democratic budget, and we have the irresponsible refusal by the Republican Party to put forth a budget at all.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I am somewhat amused by some of the comments I have heard on this side of the aisle today, and I would simply like to take a few moments to recite in fact what the history has been on this whole problem.

We are told that the Republicans did not have any opportunity to participate in the process. I find that ironic, given the fact that the chairman of the Budget Committee tried to begin a process which would have provided for an open markup to be equally participated in by both Republican and Democratic members of the committee. It was not the chairman who declined to allow Republicans to vote. It was the Republicans who declined to allow themselves to vote, which I thought was a quaint exercise in phony self discipline if ever I had seen one.

But let us really talk about what the problem is, because in my opinion the problem does not really lie here or there. I think the real problem lies in the fact that this administration is the first administration that I have ever served under which has abdicated its responsibilities under the Budget Act to provide true leadership in terms of national budgeting. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 gave the administration, whichever party, it gave the administration the right and the obligation to begin the process, to define the debate by sending down to the Congress their own budget.

I have served here for 18 years as of last Wednesday, and every previous

administration under which I have served took that responsibility seriously. They submitted budgets, which you might have disagreed with the priorities, but the fact is that they submitted budgets which were put together with seriousness, and they were taken seriously by the Congress and dealt with that way. This is the first administration I have ever served under where for 2 years in a row their budgets have arrived on Capitol Hill with everybody understanding that they are dead on arrival, not because the Congress is being obstreperous, but because the White House has prepared those budgets using such phony assumptions that from the beginning everybody recognizes that those budgets are not real documents. They are essentially political documents and not budgets.

Last year we had 12 Republican votes on this floor cast for the President's budget. I think that tells you how seriously it was taken on the Republican side of the aisle. And this year I do not know how many we are going to have actually vote for the President's budget, but we are evidently not going to have many Republicans voting for any other Republican budget either. I find that unfortunate. I had hoped that this would be the year in which we would finally see both sides of the Capitol, both parties, working together to take the document which everybody understood was a phony and try to put it back together in a way that made sense for the country.

The problem that I have is that people are writing in and asking questions about what is the problem with the budget process. The problem with the budget process is when the administration has 90 percent of the resources in the Government from OMB to every department of Government on down, and when they have 90 percent of the resources of Government and they put together a document which defines the debate to begin with, and that document is phony, that document is unrealistic, it screws up the process from word one, and it makes it impossible for any player, Republican or Democrat, to make sense out of it, therefore, and so that is why we are in this goofy position we are in today. I would suggest we have a real problem until the administration faces up to its responsibility.

The other thing I would simply say about the Gray budget is that that budget, in contrast to the administration's budget, is one which is balanced in terms of our economy. It is far more balanced in terms of meeting our international obligations and our obligations to our own people. It does not say, as the administration budget says, for instance, that we are going to spend \$5.5 billion on star wars and pay for that by a \$5.5 billion cut in the

education budget, including the total elimination of Federal support for vocational education. It tries to balance our obligations. It is a much more judicious approach, much more frank and much more honest a presentation, and on those grounds alone it ought to be passed.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman and want to stress again what we are talking about, because we have a Democratic budget and we have a Republican budget, which is the President's budget. The Republican Party in the House has decided to present no other alternative.

The gentleman talked about cuts in education in the President's budget versus the Democratic budget, cuts in health, a substantial amount less; more increase in defense, some phony revenues in the President's budget. He claims that he is going to make money from asset sales, and privatization initiatives that are very, very unlikely to yield those kinds of revenues.

The revenue estimates in the Democratic budget, we are not talking now about projections from the economy where we have taken the same estimates, but where we are talking about ways of adding revenue, the President talks about increasing fees, and in some cases he talks about asset sales, and they do not seem to make a great deal of sense.

But again, I want to stress we have this difficult problem. Meeting the \$108 billion Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction figure is very difficult, largely because the economy has performed so poorly in the past year and a half. When Gramm-Rudman was passed, the President was predicting a rate of economic growth that we have not come close to. At the time Gramm-Rudman was passing, it was passed on unrealistically optimistic assumptions about the economy. The economy has performed in a mediocre, lackluster fashion. The lack of revenue growth has meant that the amount you have to cut in spending to reach the Gramm-Rudman target goes way up.

Now that is painful, and the way that the President came up with as an effort to meet that I do not agree with, but the Democratic Budget Committee came up with about as good a job as you can do. But I can see why it causes pain. The Republican Party took the politically short term, advantageous, expedient, and they said it is going to be tough to come up with a deficit of \$108 billion. The President did not do it right, the Democratic one is subject to political criticism, let us not put one forward. And the reason, Members have heard it today, oh, the Republican Party could not come up with a budget because the Democrats froze them out. The poor Republicans are apparently unable to come up with any policy initiatives on their own. If

the Democratic budget staff would not help them, they cannot do it.

Nonsense. They have OMB ready to cooperate with them. They have ever Federal department. The Congressional Black Caucus has a budget; other in the past have had budgets with no greater resources available than those available to the Republican Party. They do not have a budget because politically they hope they can beat something with nothing. They hope politically to take the position of glorious total irresponsibility. They can criticize our budget, they can vote against the President's budget, and what is their alternative? They do not have one. Perfection. Utopia. Never-never land, because they do not get specific.

It is not persuasive to any adult in this room or any other that the Republican members of the House Budget Committee, with the OMB and every Federal department, as the gentleman from Wisconsin talked about that they can technically not come up with a budget. They do not want to because it would be too tough politically.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for yielding regularly today in this debate.

I think it is important, though, to correct a couple of things.

The President did meet his obligations and submitted a budget, and it was in detail. I did not agree with all of it. I do not agree with all of it, and will not agree with all of your budget. But he did do it.

The majority, as has been customary, did not submit the chairman's mark, they did not make a proposal.

But I would like to get to what the gentleman from Wisconsin said just a moment ago about what is the real problem that we face today. The real problem, apart from the budget process, is that you are telling me what we have to do, that we have to go to the OMB instead of sharing in the budget staff that is available, and that tell me that we are shut out right there.

But the real problem today is spending and in violating the Budget Act. After the budget has been accepted we violate the Budget Act. And the problem is too much spending. The fact is that your side has been in control of this House for so many years. The deficit we are facing, that you are having to fight with this budget and the cuts that we are all going to have to make, falls in your lap.

Mr. FRANK. I will reclaim my time. Do the words "United States Senate" mean anything to the gentleman from Tennessee? Is he familiar with that institution, because for the last 6 years they were controlled by the Republi-

an Party. And it is my understanding that every spending bill that went out of this building to be signed by the President was passed by the House and the Senate. So how it would be solely the responsibility of the House, when the bills were passed by both parties, including the Senate Republican majority, somehow escapes me.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. If the gentleman will continue to yield, sure, I am familiar with the Senate, and I am familiar that the gentleman's party controls both bodies, and for the party that—

Mr. FRANK. Let me reclaim my time because the gentleman is misstating the facts. The gentleman is misstating. What the gentleman said he was talking about was the spending, because we have not spent anything yet this year, and for the past 6 years of the Reagan administration the budgets that came out of here, and every program that came out of here was a 50-50 proposition, House and Senate. So to talk about this as if the Democratic House is responsible for everything that happened in the last 6 years, Republican Senate and Republican President, is not the facts.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1400

Mr. OBEY. I would like to point out a couple of facts in response to the gentleman's statement. No. 1, if you take a look at the pattern of spending, you note that actual spending rates for entitlements are basically determined by performance in the economy. Ronald Reagan can wave a magic wand, so can we and so can you, but in the end we cannot do a blessed thing about what the actual spending rates would be for those programs. We do have direct control over discretionary spending. The fact is that for every year but one under Ronald Reagan's administration, discretionary spending as provided by the Appropriations Committee has been less rather than more than the President of the United States has asked for. That is fact No. 1.

Mr. FRANK. Will the gentleman yield, if I may just take back my time?

If I am correct, the only time when our discretionary spending was more was during that terrible recession of 1982. It is not only that it was 1 year but it was also during a year when in 1982 we felt a little more spending was appropriate to the recession. In every other year we were lower.

Mr. OBEY. The second point; I happen to chair the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. Last year I think I was the first Appropriations Subcommittee chairman in history to receive a letter from OMB, which is the President's budget arm, receive a letter from OMB which

said in effect that the President was going to veto the bill we were presenting out of our Foreign Aid Subcommittee because we did not spend enough money. We were asked under Gramm-Rudman to get down last year by 16-percent below the previous year's level, which we did. Then we also had to cut an additional \$700 million in outlays to get down to the outlay ceiling prescribed by Gramm-Rudman, and when we did that, OMB sent us a letter that said, "Boys and girls, you are not spending enough money, the President is going to veto the bill." He also said, "What are you doing, messing around with an outlay cap" which we were required to impose by Gramm-Rudman, which the administration supported and rammed down our throats. I did not vote for Gramm-Rudman, but the President certainly insisted on it. So when I bring out a bill last year and the President says, "I am going to veto it because it does not spend enough money" and then when I bring out a foreign aid supplemental again this year, every dollar in that supplemental will be a dollar which was requested by the administration and when again we are told by Mr. Miller, the OMB Director, that they are going to advise a veto because we are not giving them enough money, I think there is a serious question involved as to whether or not the administration is seriously concerned with budget control or spending control.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman and I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee again, but again the point is clear. How much we should spend on foreign aid is a real difficult question. There are real demands there, people who are starving, allies of the United States who need help, there are fiscal constraints. The President has opted for one level. The Democrats in the House have adopted another level. The Republicans refuse to choose. And the notion—the gentleman said, "I have proven they were frozen out because they could not get the Democratic staff to help them." They had to use OMB.

The notion that the Republican Party cannot work with its own administration in formulating but has to come to our staff, no one believes it. Find a better excuse. I understand why it is hard to come up with a budget, but no one is going to believe, because we have all seen times, it will happen dozens of times every year when a Democratic package will come out of a committee, the Committees on the Judiciary, Education and Labor, Banking, and the Republicans, working with the staff of the administration they support, they will come up with an alternative. That is a legitimate process. And to whine because the Democrats decided to vote for their position and that is an excuse for not coming up with your own, we un-

derstand the point. The choices are too difficult. The President has made some which I think are too harsh on the needy, and we have made some which I do not like but I think are the best possible and the Republicans will not choose a budget. We will get nothing from them.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I thank the gentleman.

I have done some rough calculations here, and I figure that we probably controlled the House maybe 14 or 16 years out of the cumulatively 50 in each body, 100, so we will take responsibility for 15 percent of the \$2 trillion deficit if you will take responsibility for the 85 percent of the \$2 trillion deficit.

Mr. FRANK. The gentleman's argument deteriorates here. The President of the United States has signed virtually every one. Again, let us be clear what is happening. I will be glad to discuss this point but this effort to talk about past spending—and I thank the gentleman for reintroducing the U.S. Senate into the Constitution—but it is all in an effort to cover up their refusal to come up with a budget they have not got politically the courage to come and say, "Here is what we are for." I will give my Republican friends credit; they know the President's budget is unsupportable, they know their priorities are not popular with the American people; they know that if they came up with a budget which reaffected their heart of hearts, it would be politically unattractive. So if they thought they could score politically by coming up with an alternative budget to ours, of course we would see it, as they have a right to do. But they recognize they will be better off without one.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Let us talk about something maybe we can agree on. One of the ways we can reduce this deficit is perhaps by giving the President, maybe a Democratic President the next time, Republican President this time, line-item veto. Then we could trim some of the excess spending. Would the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. FRANK. No, because do you know what he is doing with that? He would defeat our efforts to stop him from going into Nicaragua and elsewhere.

Governors have line-item veto but Governors do not make wars except when Melvin Thompson was Governor of New Hampshire, he had a little itch for that every so often. But other Governors do not make wars. The President would just use that. Appropriations restrictions are one of the few ways we can control a group in the

White House and elsewhere that is shown to be somewhat irresponsible.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What needs to be understood is that item vetos have absolutely nothing to do with spending control, they have a lot to do with uncontrolled power. The fact is that item vetos would not save a dime because, as I previously indicated, if you take a look at all appropriations bills in every year that Ronald Reagan has been President except one, the appropriation bills brought out of this House have spent less money, not more money, than the President asked for. That means that what is at issue in the item veto is not giving the President the authority to control spending because he has already been higher than we are on appropriations; what it does do is to prevent the Congress from having any impact whatsoever on policy. If you want to go back all the way to 1948, I think you will find—it is unlikely that you will find any budget in which the Congress has changed any Presidential budget by more than 3 percent.

Now I think we elect Presidents to be Presidents, not kings.

It seems to me if they have 97 percent of the say on what kind of money we spend, they are doing pretty doggone well. It would also seem to me that the gentleman is correct: Can you imagine any votes ever being cast in this House against the Vietnam war if Lyndon Johnson had had the item veto? Old LBJ would have gone up to anybody in this House, he would say, "Now, fellows, I know you are interested in that Head Start Program" or "I know you are interested in the vocational education program" or "I know you are interested in that hospital construction program in your district and, by golly, I would like to help you. But you know, you know how much I need your vote on that Vietnam war." Do you think any of us would have had a chance of a snowball in you know where of stopping that war or casting votes against that war if we had turned over the power of the purse to the President? The power of the purse is the only constitutional power that we have that stands between us and the absolute domination by the President of any party. And I would suggest we remember that and quit pretending that it has something to do with budget control because it does not mean beanbag when you are talking about budget control. It has nothing to do with it.

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, and then I will yield to the other gentleman.

Mr. DURBIN. The position of the House Republicans on the budget for fiscal year 1988 brings to mind a famous speech by Winston Churchill

on the floor of the House of Commons in the 1920's. In that speech Mr. Churchill referred to his opposition as the boneless wonder. He referred to them as likened to the circus attraction of the rubbery individual who has no spine, no bones, cannot stand up, more or less sits there languid on the floor while the troops came by paying the price of admission.

I think in this situation the President has not only pulled the rug out from under the Republican Members, he has put them in a position where they need a spinal transplant.

During the last 6 weeks, the President has visited Capitol Hill twice to meet with Republican legislators. It is well publicized that last week he had little or no success on the highway authorization bill. But several weeks back, I would imagine my colleague from Tennessee and others went to the Cannon Caucus Room and heard the President say in strident tones that in this year's budget debate when the Democrats say tax, tax, tax, we say no, no, no. Invigorated by that speech, the Republicans came to the floor of this House and in their conference passed a resolution which made it virtually impossible for the Republican Party to participate in the budget debate this year.

Your resolution passed by your conference offered by Mr. Mack of Florida suggested we can hit the \$108 billion deficit reduction target without raising taxes. I think the gentleman from Tennessee knows and the President certainly knows by virtue of his own budget that is literally impossible. In this situation today we have got to face the reality. The reality of the situation is that the gentleman from Tennessee can stand and say all he wants about spending cuts as the way to hit the target; that gentleman had every opportunity to fashion a budget in that image, to make the spending cuts and to stand before his colleagues and the American people and defend them. He chose not to. As the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, whether it is Mr. DANNEMEYER of California, the Congressional Black Caucus, several years ago a freshman Democratic group, we have had the wherewithal and the resources to fashion a budget. We brought it to the membership on the floor for their approval.

As we stand here today, the Republicans have fashioned no budget. There is no image that is being portrayed, there is no message to be sent to the American people other than the fact that you are vacating yourselves from the process. Like the boneless wonder, you are going to sit languidly and let this process pass you by.

Now, that does not solve the problems facing our country; it cannot be any surprise to the gentleman from Tennessee or any of his Republican

colleagues that we have to pass budget resolution. We have known that for quite a while. But for some reason both in the Budget Committee and on the floor, your party has opted out of the process. To stand during the next several days and criticize the Democrats for their offering, for their alternative, for their proposal is disingenuous.

If you wanted to be part of the process, you had every opportunity. But the fact that your party has not put forth a document suggests that you cannot come to the American people and present a message or a proposal that is going to lead us out of the fiscal chaos that has been created during the last 6 years of this President.

□ 1410

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me that 43 Governors have line-item veto. I do not know if the Governor from the gentleman's State has line-item veto, or that he would mistrust either a Democrat or Republican President having that power.

As a matter of fact, I do not recall that not having line-item veto slowed Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam war down, either. But the fact is that we were opted out of this process. We did not have an opportunity. What we really need is some bipartisanship where we sit down together, where we can work together and solve this Nation's problems.

We were not given that opportunity. I submit to the gentleman that the budget process this year in the House has been, on your side of the aisle, profiles of squishiness because in all the past, we have had a document that came out of the committee on the majority side. This is the first time because it was hard to do.

It was the majority side that backed down from putting out a document.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I have seen accusations coming from people whose hands are not entirely clean, but we have just heard Wilt Chamberlain accuse BILL BRADLEY of being too tall.

The gentleman says that the Democratic budget was not sufficiently detailed. Compared to the Republican budget, it is infinitely detailed. The Republicans refused to have a budget.

They want to talk about the item veto; they want to talk about who came to which meeting and what. I do not think we ought to allow this to be reduced to the level of a junior high school feud, who made what motion where. Some things are undeniable.

The Republican Party, with access to the administration's expertise, could have come up with a budget. In the past, they have come up with budgets. The budget process this year is not substantially different than in past years. There is one difference: There is no Republican budget.

You know why? Because the last time they came up with a budget, they could barely get about two-thirds of their party to vote for it. They are split among themselves, and they know their priorities are unpopular.

Do you know what their implicit budget is? It would cut Medicare, perhaps, to raise military spending. The President has some tax increases in here; we have some. They say, "None whatsoever."

I am not prepared to rule out, for instance, the possibility of raising cigarette taxes so we can give more into Medicare. Apparently people on your side are. They say, "No new taxes whatsoever."

I am for raising the cigarette tax, and I hope we have the votes to do that, and using that to help old people. I would rather tax the things that cause cancer than put stress on the people who have it.

The Republican Party says that is fiscal irresponsibility. They apparently believe, and I do not know what planet they were on last year, that we passed a perfect tax bill last year; that there are no loopholes left to close, because what we have said is—maybe we will raise cigarette taxes, and I apologize to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, if I have caused him distress—maybe we will raise a few of those loopholes we will close. Maybe people should not be able to do what they have been doing with the employees stock option plans.

There is a possibility in this vast budget to find some loopholes. The Republican Party says "no." The only way to maintain that, if you want to do what they want to do, no possibility of closing loopholes or raising cigarette taxes, no, we must spend more for defense, than you have to cut education.

You have got to burden America's college students even greater if they want to go to school or keep working class children out of school. You have to cut Medicare. You have to cut back on job retraining and drug programs.

Now the President's budget does that. The Republican Party knows that the President's budget is unpopular; that their priorities are unpopular and that trying to come up with a budget is difficult.

So we have, by the Republicans, a new maxim when the budget process comes: "When the going gets tough, the Republicans quit." That is what they did. They do not want to have a budget. They want to criticize everybody else's.

We will proceed to the budget debate and the Democrats will make hard choices. They will be better hard choices than the President, and the Republicans will simply do nothing because they understand that their philosophy—do not close a tax loophole, increase military spending, cut medical care, cut education—apparently most of them believe that that is so unpopular they do not even want to put it forward.

□ 1420

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE TIM LEE CARTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this special time today so that we may honor the memory of a great statesman who served in this body as the Representative from the Fifth District of Kentucky from 1964 until 1980, the gentleman that I had the honor to succeed in the Congress of the United States, Dr. Tim Lee Carter, who, as the Members know, passed away on March 27 of this year and was laid to rest the following Sunday in his native Monroe County, in Tompkinsville, KY.

We have asked for this special time so that the Members of this body may pay their respects to the man who walked these Halls and held these hands and helped pass legislation which was so beneficial to millions of Americans then and even now, especially in the health fields.

Of course, as the Members know, Dr. Carter, a native of Monroe County in Kentucky, served here 16 years. Before that he was a practicing physician in his home county, practicing there as a rural doctor for all those years, visiting the families in that part of Kentucky as a home physician, going night and day, treating those who needed help.

When he came to the Congress, he did not forget his experience as a physician and his calling in life, that being as a healer of men. Not only did he maintain on the weekends much of his medical practice back home, treating those who were ill, but he worked also here in the Halls of Congress, helping to pass legislation which has affected millions of people and continues to do so today in the field of health.

He served in his later years in Congress as the ranking Republican on the Health Subcommittee, a subcommittee of what was then called the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and now called the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and with his colleagues he helped to pass landmark legislation in the 1970's to change America's methods of address-

ing the health needs of the people of the country, especially those who were underprivileged economically.

His mark remains with us. We had the honor of attending Dr. Carter's funeral, of course, as did our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. CARROLL HUBBARD, and, of course, many hundreds of people were there. They were there out of a spirit of love, and there was a spirit there of comradeship and of renewed friendships, because this was such a kind and compassionate man, this man who held this seat that I now hold.

When Dr. Carter chose to retire in 1980, a number of us ran for the office, but it was my slogan that I think sort of said a lot, and that was this: "I will attempt to walk in his footsteps, but no one can fill his shoes." After being here almost 7 years, I can say that more emphatically now than I did then, that I may be able to try to walk in his footsteps, but I do not think anyone can ever fill Dr. Carter's shoes.

Those footsteps were very large. He made a great impact on the Nation's legislation, especially in health. He made a heavy impact on his colleagues here. People say to me almost daily, "What a wonderful, kind, and compassionate, caring person Dr. Carter was." They say that whether it be one of the Capitol Hill police or whether it be one of the aides here on the floor or whether it be the Speaker of this body or any Member of this body.

He truly had an impact on the people here in Washington, just as he did, of course, back home. And I can tell the Members that in his district, a very poor district in southern Kentucky, where people have been struggling always to establish a better way of life for the people, Dr. Carter enlisted in that battle, and he fought it long and hard, traveling untold miles, sleeping hardly any during those times when he was able to go back home and visit those counties, 27 counties in all.

He felt such a need to help the people who needed it most that many times he did so to the detriment of his own health. I have seen many a time in my county or perhaps one of those times when I happened to be where he was when I realized that here was a man who was traveling many miles, staying up long hours, a man who was so tired as he would make his small talks to the small gatherings, and then, after the speeches were made, welcoming the dozens of people who would come forward one at a time so he could minister to them with aid that would come from the Federal Government that he was able to command for them.

So we talk of a statesman, a man who was a leader in these Halls; we talk of a kind and compassionate human being who daily cared for the

people around him; and we talk of an effective statesman, an effective legislator who was able to work in a bipartisan fashion both in this body and with the other body in effecting and molding legislation that would be helpful not only to his people but to the Nation's people and indeed the world's people.

Even after Dr. Carter retired from this body, the President appointed him to head the American Cancer Advisory Group, a research organization to help fund and help pass along the research dollars to help in the fight against this deadly disease. And I suspect that Dr. Carter in taking on that responsibility felt an even higher calling than had been his before because, as many of the Members know, Dr. and Kathleen Carter's only son, Starr Carter, passed away from leukemia at a very young age. He was 21, a beautiful young man, all you would want in a son. He contracted this very deadly disease, and, of course, all the treatments were to no avail. And I think for a physician, for Dr. Tim Lee Carter, the inability of medical science to save his only son, a son whom he loved so much, contributed heavily to his decision to leave this body and go back to his home.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion that we have today in talking of this great man. We could talk of the contribution he made to medicine or in the legislative Halls in dealing with humanity, but I think those of us who knew him well prefer to talk of him more as a person who loved people and who was caring enough to send the very best, so to speak.

So I welcome those who are here to join in this tribute to Dr. Carter. It is with a sad note that we note his passing, and it is with a happy note that we come here today to tell of his accomplishments in this body and in this city and in this Nation, and indeed in the world.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from the Sixth District of Kentucky.

□ 1430

Mr. HOPKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to this institution as a freshman, Tim Lee Carter was the senior Republican from Kentucky.

In listening to the words of deserved tribute and fond remembrance spoken here today for our friend and distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Tim Lee Carter of the Fifth District of Kentucky, it becomes clear that this man of passionate competence left an imposing mark on this institution and those he touched in passing this way.

Kentuckians, particularly those reared in the small towns and rural sections of our commonwealth, as I was, reserve a special respect and willingly invest their trust in members of the medical profession—the country doctors, if you will.

It was natural, then, that as a freshman Member of Congress, I routinely turned to Dr. Carter for advice and counsel. He responded willingly, generously, and with great good sense on every occasion.

I knew Tim Lee Carter as a man of strong conviction and clear purpose. He was a dedicated public servant who spent his entire adult life unselfishly serving his fellow man. As a combat veteran of World War II, as a skilled physician, and as a beloved representative of the people of southeast Kentucky, Dr. Carter forever was his brother's keeper.

He was proudly a partisan Republican, yet he never failed to understand the proper bounds of partisanship. His country, his people, then his party were the priorities that earned Congressman Tim Lee Carter a special place in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the memories of all of those who had the privilege of serving with him. We are a better country, and this is a better institution for his having passed our way.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his comments that are very well placed. We appreciate your thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD].

Mr. HUBBARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] taking this special order to honor our beloved friend and former colleague, the Honorable Tim Lee Carter.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to pay tribute to a longtime friend of mine and our former colleague, Congressman Tim Lee Carter of Kentucky, who passed away on March 27 at the age of 76.

Dr. Tim Lee Carter was a distinguished statesman and physician from Tompkinsville, KY, who was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1964. Congressman Tim Lee Carter served eight terms before retiring in 1980.

It is interesting to note that for much of that time, Dr. Carter was the only practicing physician in the Congress and was a major contributor to health and hospital legislation. It was Congressman Tim Lee Carter who was the first Republican in the House of Representatives to seek withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam.

Dr. Tim Lee Carter was a dear friend of mine. Although he was a Republican, he was especially helpful to me when I was elected to Congress in 1974 and when I was a freshman here in

1975. Certainly, his friendship and assistance were most meaningful to me and I appreciated his efforts to be of all possible help when I was new elected to Congress.

Dr. Tim Lee Carter was a compassionate man and one who made great contributions to his State and Nation.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I state that Congressman Tim Lee Carter was one of the most kind individuals I knew. He almost always had a special word of two for the Capitol Hill Police, for the clerks, for his colleagues, and for many others with whom he came into contact.

On Sunday afternoon, March 29, it was unique and meaningful that at the funeral of Dr. Tim Lee Carter not only was there a large number of State, Federal, and local government officials but also about 500 of the people of his hometown of Tompkinsville, KY.

In remarks I gave at the burial ceremony I mentioned that in leaving this life, Tim Lee Carter joins his only child—a son named Stars Carter in Heaven.

My wife Carol joins me in extending our sympathy to the survivors of this outstanding Kentuckian and American. Survivors include his lovely wife Kathleen Carter of Tompkinsville, KY; his brother, Judge James C. Carter, Jr., of Tompkinsville; his sister, Mrs. Vivian Hayes of Louisville, KY; his nieces Sue H. Evans and Becky Nevius, both of Louisville; and his nephew Ray M. Evans, Jr., of Jacksonville, FL.

I am proud to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of Congressman Tim Lee Carter.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank our colleague from Kentucky, CARROLL HUBBARD, for those kind words and compliment him too on the words that he spoke at the burial site at the funeral.

Let me also, at this juncture, mention that I spoke a couple of days ago by phone with Kathleen, the widow of Dr. Carter, and told her of this special order and she was so thankful to those of you who are speaking today, that you would take the time and come and say these words about her beloved, departed husband.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

□ 1440

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, my friend and colleague, the Congressman from the Fifth District, Mr. HAL ROGERS, for giving us the opportunity today to come and say a few words about Tim Lee Carter.

You know, institutional memory is something that sometimes means a great deal, but we do not always take

enough time perhaps to do all the remembering that we should.

I come from a background, as my colleagues know, where I was literally raised in the Halls of this Congress. I was born as my father served as a sitting Member of Congress before I was elected. I was raised watching the process. I think during that time period you begin to get perhaps an inside feeling for who actually works in the Halls of Congress, for the other Members and for their families. From that perspective I had the great honor of knowing Dr. Tim Lee Carter under a variety of social conditions. A lot of situations stand out in my own mind.

I remember going to his house as a young boy being raised and spending the night with him, because his son who died of leukemia was my age. We shared many moments. I remember his son coming to our house and spending the night, as you would when you were getting older.

One thing from that perspective, not as a colleague, not as a peer, but as a child growing up, you can tell who are real people, who are kind people and who have real human characteristics from those who are fake.

Dr. Tim Lee Carter was a man of great compassion. He was a man who cared about his fellow people. This was obvious to me as I was growing up, as I watched the workings of Congress in the mid-sixties and early seventies. It was obvious to me when I reviewed his legislative history and looked at him, at his own words, the program he was most fond of and happiest to see that got passed was a program of health care, of preventive medicine for poor children and the families of poor children.

When you come from a rural district, when you come from a poor district and you see the suffering and the anguish and the pain and you see the lack of recourse for people who are good people, they just do not have a lot of money. Somebody has got to stand up for them. Somebody has got to take their side.

Well, as part of the institutional memory that we have here in this House that makes this country great, we have got to remember the Tim Lee Carters who came along and gave something of themselves for other people, who stood up and gave just a little spark of that human compassion that separates this country and its greatness from others that we have seen across this world today. I think Tim Lee Carter is a man who deserves that type of recognition.

There is a quotation that I think is probably appropriate from Alexander Pope, who said:

Statesman, yet friend of truth, of souls sincere and actions faithful and an honor clear, who broke no promise and served no private end, who gained no title and who lost no friend.

I think somehow that quotation goes well with the memory of Tim Lee Carter.

I think we would all do well to pattern our actions and our lives upon that compassion that he had for all people.

Mr. Speaker, I would thank my distinguished colleague and friend from the Fifth District for allowing me this opportunity to address my colleagues and his family and tell them exactly how wonderful a gentleman he was and how joyous we are that we had him with us.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, for those kind words.

I must say, of course, the gentleman's father served in this body for, lo, those many years along with Dr. Carter for a number of them. He was also a giant, Carl Perkins, of course, who served in this body through its history and whom his son has succeeded in that seat from eastern Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for those kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend from Kentucky for taking this time and yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was here sometime prior to the coming of this great man we are eulogizing today, Dr. Tim Lee Carter. I shall never forget standing out in the hall on his first day in 1964. He said to me, "You're the fellow that represents that district across the Ohio River in Illinois." And from that day forward, Tim Lee Carter always called me his neighbor.

If there ever was the epitome of the words, "Still waters run deep," it certainly fits Dr. Tim Lee Carter, because he was a kind, gentle, quiet man, but tremendously effective.

I can always recall when he would take the well to make a speech, whether it was on a health subject or any other matter. You could hear a pin drop in this Chamber because he had that kind of respect in this body.

It is a great loss when a man like that not only leaves this legislative body, but leaves this world, because everyone in his community in Kentucky and in Washington who came in contact with him, and it has been alluded to here by the Capitol Police and others, he always had time to stop and to talk and just exude that friendship. When he started talking to you, you knew right away that you had made a new friend.

We all miss Dr. Carter. I want to congratulate all the Members of the Kentucky delegation for the fine things they have said about Tim Lee Carter and as one who served with him for many years, I subscribe to every word that has been uttered here

on the floor today and extend to his family my deepest sympathy.

I thank the gentleman so much for yielding.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind remarks. The gentleman is correct, I say to my colleague, that Dr. Carter was quiet and soft spoken and compassionate; but as we know, when he believed something, he believed it so deeply that he was immovable and showed fierce determination above anything I have ever seen when he felt he was on the right path. Shame on you if you tried to move him, because you could not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for taking this time to recognize our dear departed colleague, former Congressman Dr. Tim Lee Carter.

Just let me say that when I came here as a freshman in 1977, Dr. Carter was one of the senior Members who befriended me.

I want to say to the family, to his wife and surviving children, we remember your father as a very kind and compassionate man and probably one of the more courtly gentlemen in this whole body. He was just a very compassionate, sincere person; however, based on what my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky has just said, I saw times when legislation seemed not to favor the doctor's good constituents, and let me tell you, that kind, compassionate man, turned into a tiger. He was a real fighter, but as my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois just said, he was always well respected and always listened to.

So I just want to remember him and pay him a great debt of gratitude for his friendship to me. I think this Congress owes him a great debt of gratitude. The country owes him a debt of gratitude.

All I can say is, "Thank you so much, oh kind and faithful servant." He will be missed, but he will be forever remembered, and that is really the measure that we judge great people by.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1450

Mr. ROGERS. I thank our colleague for those wonderful words.

We are running short of time here, but I wanted to mention before we closed that we have had notes and messages from various other Members of Congress who are in various committee hearings at the moment and cannot make it to the floor who wanted to be remembered with their words, and I am going to take a few minutes here to share some of those.

One gentleman who served with Dr. Carter all of the time that he served here from Kentucky was our colleague from the Fifth District, the Honorable BILL NATCHER, who has served for so many years in this Congress, and is perhaps one of its most respected Members, who has written these words for the record that I want to share very briefly, because he could not be here because he is chairing his committee hearing even as we speak, and could not make it to the floor.

Representative NATCHER says:

Mr. Speaker, one of the giants of our Congress, Tim Lee Carter of Kentucky, will be remembered by his colleagues, not only for his excellent service to the people of the Fifth Congressional District, but also because of his strong leadership and dedication to health and education.

According to my information, 11,137 Members have served in both Houses of the Congress since March 4, 1789. This, Mr. Speaker, includes the present new Members in both Houses and of this number, 590 have served in both Houses. I sincerely believe that I have served with nearly 2,000 Members since I have been a Member of Congress and one of the nicest things that has happened to me is the opportunity I had to serve with my friend Tim Lee Carter. He was an outstanding doctor and an excellent legislator. He established a record that will long be remembered, not only in Kentucky, but throughout this country.

I will remember him as a friend, an outstanding legislative leader, a symbol of strength and an example of the character and accomplishment that our Legislative Branch of the Government should always stand for. Few public servants have held such a warm and well-loved place in the hearts of their constituents.

He was a man of high integrity, a man of compassion, a man with determination and fairness, a man with sure knowledge, a man who cherished and protected the prerogatives of the House, and a man endowed with the qualities of greatness. He was a practical man. He was a gifted man and he possessed the necessary kind of courage that made him an outstanding Member of Congress.

Tim Lee Carter served with distinction and honor and, Mr. Speaker, I deemed it a great pleasure and a high honor to have been the friend of Tim Lee Carter. I have lost a true friend and this country has lost an outstanding patriot. To his lovely wife, Kathleen, and to the other members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from the Third District of Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the Fifth District for having taken this special order in behalf of the dear and departed colleague of ours, Congressman and Dr. Tim Lee Carter.

As the gentleman has said, Dr. Carter was a very exemplary Member of Congress. He was an outstanding legislator in his field of health care. He was outstanding in his concern for the least among us, the people who hurt,

the people who have pain, and Tim Lee always came to their rescue by trying to minister to them in his role as doctor, and also to minister to them in his role as Member of Congress. He was just a superb Member of this body.

I think as my friend from the Fifth District has illustrated in his statements and we from Kentucky have said earlier, there was something unique about "Doc" Carter, and that was his humanity. The humanness in Dr. Carter came out every single moment of every day of his life, whether he was sitting on the floor in the midst of a difficult debate about some national health care initiative, or whether it was in the Speaker's lobby as we passed casually to say hello, or whether it was back in our office or back in Kentucky.

Dr. Carter was a wonderful person, a good, decent, thoughtful, nice man, and so probably in my judgment he bound together the two roles that we play in this general assembly, and that is the role as lawmaker and the role as human being, trying to help people.

So when the word came to Helen and me this weekend that Dr. Carter had died, it was as if a member of our own family had died. Helen and I have had a chance to be with "Doc" Carter and Kathleen officially and socially, and in both roles they were delightful people. So I thank my friend for having given this body and this country a chance to join with his colleagues from Kentucky in expressing our fondness and affection and undying devotion to this gentleman whom we knew as the Congressman from the Fifth District of Kentucky.

We, all of us, join in sending to Kathleen and to the family our condolences and deep sympathies, and I think that my friend from the Fifth District does a superb job. We are delighted to have him. He has done excellently for the Commonwealth, but I think that he would be the first one to say that it will be a long, long time before this Chamber sees the likes of "Doc" Carter again.

I thank my friend.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank my colleague for those very wonderful remarks, and he is exactly correct, it will be a long time before we see anyone of the stature of Dr. Carter.

We also have similar messages from gentlemen who were unable to be with us but sent along written messages that I will file with the RECORD from our friend, our colleague from New Jersey, "MATT" RINALDO, from our colleague from Mississippi, "SONNY" MONTGOMERY, and our colleague and neighbor from Tennessee, Congressman JAMES QUILLEN, and from our colleague from California, GLENN ANDERSON, all of whom served with Dr. Carter in this body, and we will be

sure that these are filed in the RECORD.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my former colleagues, Dr. Tim Lee Carter, who passed away on March 27.

Dr. Carter was an outstanding Member of Congress who served his rural Kentucky district for 16 years. He was very bright and highly respected, both as a country doctor and as a Member of Congress.

I always admired him as a dedicated public servant.

Dr. Carter worked hard, not only to help the people he represented, but also to help people everywhere.

I remember working with him on black lung legislation. He was very concerned about the health of our Nation's coal miners. He knew the problems faced by those miners who suffered with black lung and he wanted to do everything possible to help them.

Dr. Carter became known as a leading spokesman on health issues because he cared so much about people.

Those of us who served with him in Congress will miss him, but we will never forget his good deeds.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues from Kentucky to pay tribute to Dr. Tim Lee Carter, a close personal friend. I join the people of the Fifth District in mourning the loss of this Kentucky thoroughbred.

Elected to the 89th Congress from a predominantly rural district, Tim came to us as a country doctor. As the only practicing physician in the 89th Congress, he brought a unique perspective to health issues and social programs.

His leadership, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was instrumental in passing legislation to provide preventive medical care for disadvantaged children. By aiding these children, Tim hoped someday they too, would be able to lead healthy and successful lives. As an early advocate of catastrophic health insurance, he showed foresight that 20 years later would prove to be visionary.

While we benefited from his expertise, his constituents were by far the true beneficiaries of his efforts. He worked to improve the district he was sent to represent, and saw to it that programs were put through to improve the quality of life. When he left us here in Washington, he continued to serve the people of his district by resuming his medical practice to help his friends and neighbors.

Tim was a dear friend, I often remember the times he would stop by my office to share some of his favorite Makers Mark Bourbon and talk about the days proceedings. He will be sorely missed by those of us who had the honor to serve with him.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker for 16 years, Tim Lee Carter served his Kentucky constituents, and all the people of the United States, extraordinarily well as a Member of Congress. His death is a great loss and saddens us all.

For 6 years, I had the privilege of working with him as a member of the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment. I was even more fortunate that Dr. Carter was the

subcommittee's senior Republican when I became chairman. I will never forget the enormous cooperation and experience he shared with me.

No colleague has been more honorable, more decent, or more compassionate than Tim Lee Carter. Representative Carter was, above all else, the quintessential gentleman. Like all of us, he had a party allegiance, a regional commitment, and strong views on legislative issues. What he lacked was even the slightest capacity for personal pettiness. He had opponents, but no enemies. Though he was both articulate and eloquent, he had neither taste nor talent for distortion or misrepresentation.

Tim Lee Carter spent virtually all of his adult life as a legislator, yet, at every turn, he displayed the gentleness, practicality, and philosophical vision of the country doctor he once had been.

As the ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, Representative Carter showed a passionate interest in Federal support for biomedical research. His chief focus was on the effort to find a cure for cancer. His interest reflected not only his medical background, but a personal tragedy that could never be completely assuaged. In 1977, his beloved son, Billy Starr Carter, died of leukemia, having barely entered manhood.

This House and our country will never stop needing men and women of Dr. Carter's dedication and sensitivity. I am grateful that I had the great honor to serve with him and—more importantly—to count Tim Lee Carter as a friend. I learned much from his legislative skills and his profound appreciation of the ultimate responsibilities of legislators in a free society. As long as there are Members who served with Tim Lee Carter, all he taught, by instruction and by example, will continue to leave a mark on our work.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in the death of former Congressman Tim Lee Carter we have experienced the loss of a good friend and legislator. Tim Lee and I were both elected to Congress in 1964, and served together until 1980 when he retired.

Not only has the Congress lost a good friend, but residents of Kentucky's Fifth District have lost a loyal Representative, physician and friend. A man of independent convictions, Tim Lee represented his strong views on health issues as ranking minority of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment.

Tim Lee stood for the conservative viewpoint of the Cumberland Plateau region, an area of strong Republican convictions. I will certainly remember him well as a good friend and trusted colleague.

Mr. QUILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for providing Members this opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of Dr. Tim Lee Carter who died late last month.

I was truly saddened to learn of Dr. Carter's passing. I was privileged to serve with him here in the House from 1965 through 1980. Let me say that Congressman Carter was one of the finest gentlemen I have met in this life. He was a courtly gentle man who was courteous and decent to all and whose heart was full of kindness and compassion for all. By

virtue of his knowledge as a physician, his intelligence and his great heart, Congressman Carter had a major impact on the Nation's health policies. This is probably his most lasting legacy to the Nation arising out of his congressional service.

He was a great credit to our Republican Party and served with distinction for many years as the ranking Republican on the Health Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as it was then called. And always he was a man of the people—the country doctor from Tompkinsville, in Monroe County, KY.

I want to express my condolences to Dr. Carter's wife, Kathleen, and his brother, Judge James Carter, his sister, Mrs. Vivian Hayes, and other members of the family in this time of sorrow. We who were fortunate to know him will miss Tim Lee Carter.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion for me to take note of the recent passing of Dr. Tim Lee Carter with whom I served in Congress for 11 years. Congressman Carter was a fine and decent man whose concern for the interests of rural America were reflected in all of his activities. His record on behalf of the less fortunate is a memorial in itself. I join with my colleagues in commemorating his life and mourning his passing.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing profound regret at the recent death of our former colleague, Dr. Tim Lee Carter.

Dr. Carter enjoyed the admiration and respect of all of us who had the honor to serve with him. A country doctor, he brought to this body a sense of decency and compassion which touched us all. I had the privilege of serving with Tim on the Energy and Commerce Committee and was deeply moved by his concern for the health care needs not only of his constituents in rural Kentucky but of all Americans. Years ago he recognized the need for a catastrophic health insurance plan. It would be a great tribute to his memory if this Congress would enact legislation to provide for individuals in danger of being impoverished by a catastrophic illness.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Tim's widow, Kathleen on her great loss. I hope she may gain some comfort in the knowledge that her grief is shared by all of us.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague from Kentucky, Representative HAL ROGERS, in paying tribute to the late Dr. Tim Lee Carter. I had the privilege of serving with him. I remember that he was almost always on the floor of this Chamber and always very involved in legislation that affected his beloved State of Kentucky.

As a physician, Dr. Carter was most helpful to me and to other Members in this House on health issues. We benefited from his knowledge and his understanding of those issues.

He was a dedicated public servant. The people of Kentucky's Fifth District were fortunate to have had a man of his convictions and experience as their Representative here in Washington for 16 years.

He will be missed.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Carter in his lifetime in the hundreds of speeches and thousands of speeches

that he gave to his home district at the courthouse meetings that he attended to each year in every one of the 27½ counties that he represented would always close those meetings with a quotation from an Irish prayer that I am sure many of the Members have heard. I do not intend to quote the prayer, but I thought it appropriate that as we close these proceedings in paying tribute to our beloved and late friend and colleague, Dr. Carter, that we ought to quote the closing line of that Irish prayer.

After quoting the entire poem, Dr. Carter would say to the folks gathered before him, as we say to him today, "Until we meet again, may God hold you in the hollow of his hand."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of our special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENNY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL CAVE RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to be joined by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] in introducing the Federal Cave Resources Protection Act. A companion measure is this day also being introduced in the other body by the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. DASCHLE.

The purpose of this legislation is to strengthen the ability of Federal agencies to protect and manage these unique and fragile resources when they are situated on Federal lands. The act enjoys the support of the National Speleological Society, the American Cave Conservation Association, and Defenders of Wildlife.

As nonrenewable resources, once caves are destroyed they are gone forever. Exacerbating this situation is the fact that cave ecosystems are delicately balanced and easily damaged.

Caves are home to a rich variety of species, and many as-yet-undiscovered species are thought to dwell there as well. These abundant and diverse species provide a gene pool which is valuable for scientific study and advancement. Caves are also an important conduit for underground rivers which serve as water supplies for many rural communities. Equally important, caves are a favored recreation site for visitors enjoying both their pristine

and unusual beauty and the adventure of cave exploration.

Despite the value of cave resources on Federal lands, there is no Federal law which specifically protects these resources. Many existing laws such as the National Forest Management Act and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act could be interpreted to include cave management under their purview; however, they do not specifically mention caves. A report by the Congressional Research Service on cave protection stated this problem succinctly:

It appears that the existing land management laws are broad enough to permit management of cave resources, but they do not expressly address that goal or compel that result.

In the absence of such direction, management of caves on Federal lands is inconsistent and inadequate. In several New Mexico caves, for example, colonies of Mexican Free Tail bats have been decimated by vandals. In Idaho, toxic waste was abandoned in a cave and leaked into its soil. Throughout the United States, graffiti and litter in and removal of stalactite and stalagmite formations from caves on Federal lands have increased.

The Federal Cave Resources Protection Act addresses these concerns by both empowering and directing the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to include cave resources in land management plans.

The act also authorizes the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to withhold information on the nature and location of a cave on Federal land when disclosure of such information would create a substantial risk of harm to it. Although the caving community has more extensive files on the location and nature of caves on Federal lands than do Federal agencies, it is hesitant to share these files with the Federal Government out of concern that wide distribution of the information would result in vandalism and looting of unprotected caves.

The enactment of this provision will, therefore, increase the amount of information available to Federal land managers by encouraging the cave community to share their extensive maps with them.

Federal land managers have repeatedly stated to me that a law providing comprehensive authority expressly to protect cave resources would assist them in their management duties. The Federal Cave Resources Protection Act responds to this need by affirming that it is the policy of the United States to protect cave resources on Federal lands and providing the specific authority to do so.

A summary of the Federal Cave Resources Protection Act follows:

SUMMARY OF THE FEDERAL CAVE RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT

The purpose of the Federal Cave Resources Protection Act is to affirm the importance of the nation's federal cave resources and to provide the federal government with the specific authority to manage this valuable resource.

The Act:

I. (a) Provides the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture with the specific authority to manage Federal cave resources.

(b) Directs that caves be considered in land management planning.

II. Provides the Secretaries with the authority to withhold information on the nature and location of a cave when disclosure of such information would create a substantial risk of harm to it.

(a) A Governor of the state can obtain withheld information on a cave in that state upon written request and with a commitment to protect the confidentiality of the information and ensure the cave's protection; and

(b) any bona fide research institution meeting the aforementioned requirements may receive the withheld information.

III. Allows any person to apply for a permit to collect or remove any natural resource from caves. If a substantial risk is involved to the cave, the Secretary shall require the posting of a bond to offset any potential damage.

IV. Establishes a penalty for disturbing cave life, interfering with the free movement of any cave resource into or out of any cave, removing any natural resource without a permit, or soliciting any person to commit the aforementioned violations.

V. Establishes a cave management fund from the monies collected from a cave permit fees, bond forfeitures, and fines.

LET US NOT FORGET "BUY AMERICAN" PROVISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, now that the Congress has voted to override the President's veto of the surface transportation reauthorization bill and the highway bill has become law, I wish to address this body on the Buy American provisions of the legislation. It was this Chamber that voted overwhelmingly to strengthen the Buy American language of the bill. However, the finished highway bill failed to include cement in this important provision.

It was stated by Members of the other body that any strengthening of the Buy American provisions would invite a veto by the administration. The other body chose not to include the strengthening language, conferees reaffirmed the will of the other body, and the administration vetoed the bill regardless of any strengthening Buy American language.

Does this not suggest that our colleagues who opposed the Buy American provisions used the threat of a Presidential veto as a scare tactic to kill any proposed strengthening language to purchase American-made highway materials? Their scare tactics became all too real when the President chose to veto the highway bill because the legislation included far too many demonstration projects which provided unnecessary budget expenditures to the American taxpayer.

During the opening months of the 100th Congress, the House voted overwhelmingly to agree with the conference report accompanying the Surface Transportation and Uniform Reloca-

tion Assistance Act of 1987. It was in the 99th Congress, that the House and the other body voted and passed the highway legislation but Congress was unable to send the bill to the White House for approval because they could not agree.

□ 1500

The conferees were unable to reach an agreement or chose not to in the 99th Congress.

This was important unfinished business that we were pleased to resolve so that highway construction could begin as soon as possible. So conferees finally came to an agreement on a much delayed highway reauthorization, and without that reauthorization our Nation's highway system would have been at a standstill. Thousands of jobs would have been jeopardized, and further delays of this legislation would have only meant higher costs to the American taxpayer.

Chairman JAMES HOWARD and Mr. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and Chairman GLENN ANDERSON, and Mr. BUD SHUSTER of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, are to be commended for working to bring this reauthorization before the 100th Congress for timely consideration.

During the 99th and now in the 100th Congress, as a member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, I also worked to help prepare the highway reauthorization legislation for committee markup for House passage, for enactment, and it was when the highway bill was first before the 99th Congress that I offered amending language to the legislation designed to strengthen that Buy American provision. Steel was already in there.

The House overwhelmingly approved, 300 to 102, the Bentley amendment which would prohibit the use of all foreign cement for construction of projects under the federally funded highway bill. And it is certainly encouraging to have so many of my colleagues in the House take a stand against unfair trading practices of foreign nations. And it is my hope that those of us in the 100th Congress who supported the Bentley amendment will continue to support measures designed to build a strong industrial base resulting in jobs for American labor. A stronger national economy will be achieved with the passage of legislation written to promote American industry.

I am very strongly of the opinion that U.S. taxpayers' money should be spent only on purchases in the United States, not overseas, and we in the Congress should be making laws that foster jobs and development in America. The erosion of the industrial base

in this Nation must be reversed. Buy American provisions are necessary to achieve a stronger domestic industrial base, and it was with that in mind that I pushed on the Buy American provision for cement.

When the other body considered the Buy American language, a number of inaccurate statements were asserted, and it was as a result of those inaccuracies that the strengthened Buy American language was defeated. I am trying today to try to straighten out some of that language, and I want people to think along the lines that there were inaccuracies then. And because the pressures were so strong, the House conferees were not able to overcome the pressures from the other body.

At that time, one of the inaccuracies stated by Members of the other body was that the United States would be unable to meet the needs of domestic consumption of cement for Federal highway construction. This is a false accusation, because according to the U.S. Department of Commerce in a study that was made on the domestic cement industry, the United States would be capable of meeting cement demand in the United States, and this was corroborated by another study from the Bureau of Mines. The Bureau of Mines, after all, are responsible for our natural resources.

What has happened is that, as foreign imports have increased in this country, the number of operating plants for cement decreased. So if one took into consideration the amount of cement actually being produced at this moment, no, that would not be adequate. But they did not take into consideration the fact that production of cement could be stepped up very quickly, and plants put in production, and we would have had adequate supplies.

And despite the fact that the House had overwhelmingly voted to include the strengthening amending language for cement, the conference report to H.R. 2 included no provision nor any form of compromise, and the conference language appears as if no vote was ever made in the House to let us use American cement. This is another blow for another American industry.

When we take into consideration the increasing trade deficit, we have to wonder what is going to happen to our domestic industries. And we have to think about the fact that our domestic industries are forced to compete unfairly with foreign markets.

Our steel, cement, asphalt, lumber, maritime, and other vital industries are forced to compete abroad in highly subsidized foreign competition, non-tariff failures and restrictive foreign policies. Thousands of American jobs have been lost or are in jeopardy as a result, and many of these are tied into the Federal highway program, a pro-

gram, ironically, that was kicked off in 1982 to provide for jobs for Americans.

I remember very well the salesmanship that went into adding that 5 cents a gallon to the gasoline tax, and the whole thrust of it was we can rebuild American highways and American bridges, and we will be putting some 350,000 Americans back to work. Well, not if we keep buying all of the supplies from overseas.

We should not forget that the trade deficit with foreign nations is at an all time high, and that is why I say that domestic policies must be written to reduce this problem. Japan and Canada happen to be two of the leading nations contributing to that trade deficit, and these two are involved in selling many of the components used in highway construction.

In 1985, Japan sold 3 billion dollars' worth of steel to the United States and the total United States trade deficit with Japan today is \$46.6 billion. That was 3 billion dollars' worth of steel that they sold here.

Even though we say today that the United States has the world's strongest economy, it is fragile and, therefore, the question that we in Congress must be prepared to answer is where will that economy be tomorrow, not just where do we stand today. Since 1960, our productivity growth has been outstripped by almost all of our trading partners. Japanese productivity growth has been five times greater than our own, and Japan's productivity now exceeds that of the United States in steel, in transportation equipment, electrical, general and precision machinery.

I am delighted, as a matter of fact, that the one Buy American provision that remained in the Surface Transportation Act dealt with steel, and that at least the steel products used in highway construction will be American, and that that remained in the bill all the way through and now is law.

For other products used in highway construction, like lumber and asphalt, the story is interesting. The principal supplier of lumber to the United States in 1985 was Canada. Nearly \$3 billion of lumber was sold to the United States by Canada in that same year. The total United States trade deficit with Canada is \$22 billion. Where is our lumber in this picture?

And then on the other, asphalt, Venezuela was the major supplier of asphalt. The United States purchased \$200 million worth of asphalt from Venezuela in 1985. Our total trade deficit with Venezuela is in excess of \$3 billion. Do we not produce asphalt in this country?

I think these are rather startling statistics, and the list goes on and on. If we are to reduce the trade deficit and achieve fair trading practices, then this Congress must begin passing legislation that looks after our Ameri-

can-made products, and American industry and labor.

□ 1510

The thrust of failing to include amending language to strengthen the Buy American provision is proof that yet another American industry is going under to foreign competition. Foreign industries everyday will continue to violate fair trading practices by illegal dumping on the shores of the United States.

Let us talk about that illegal dumping in the area of cement. For instance, Taiwan and Korea sell cement for \$65 a ton at home and \$30 a ton in the United States. Japan has the same comparison.

Spain sells cement for \$71 a ton in Spain and \$39 a ton in the United States. Mexico sells cement for \$56 a ton in Mexico and \$29 a ton in the United States.

Now let us see how they do this: Each of these countries which produce the cement at home does not allow any foreign cement to enter their borders whatsoever. As you can see their production costs are rather low and their selling price at home is quite substantial. There is a large margin of profit in there, anywhere from \$25 to \$35 a ton at home. Eighty percent of the cement that each of these countries produces at home is consumed right there. They make that big profit, the \$25 to \$35 a ton on that 80 percent. The 20 percent is what they ship into the United States and they send it in here at dumped prices. Now when the cement industry appealed to the International Trade Commission for help on this, the International Trade Commission finally determined that "Well, you are making a profit now and therefore you are not harmed."

The fact that the profit by the U.S. producers was negligible, was very small, was not taken into consideration. The American producers had to mark their prices way down to meet the foreign prices in this country.

Now because of the foreign industry at home making such a substantial profit, they will be able to maintain and replace their plants, as they become obsolete. Right today the U.S. plants that are still operating are state of the art, as are those abroad, and we do have the same sources of natural resources, the same amount of natural resources in this country as they have abroad. So therefore, as for productivity and state of the art equipment, we can do it. But we cannot do it at those prices and earn enough profit, our industries cannot do it, in order to replace the equipment as it becomes obsolete in this country. And that is the key. As those plants wear down, I am told by the cement industry they will not be able to replace them and therefore this whole industry will go under

and we will be totally dependent on foreign sources for all of our cement.

Looking at the figures, from 1984 to 1987, foreign cement imports have increased 300 percent, from 4.2 million tons in 1983 to 8.9 million tons in 1984 to 14.5 million tons in 1985 and an estimated 17.5 to 18 million tons last year. The simple fact of the matter is that the U.S. cement industry cannot compete with imports subsidized by foreign governments. If the conference report had included strengthen Buy American language, then foreign producers would have been encouraged to operate in the United States creating U.S. jobs and increasing the U.S. tax base.

No serious foreign trade repercussions would result because this action is taken in response to the unfair dumping practices of foreign competitors. And can you see any U.S. cement producers being as free or have any freedom at all to act in foreign countries as do those foreign producers in our country?

In the 1985 to 1986 period the United States became the world's largest cement importing country for the first time in history and it is going up. Use of domestic cement would improve the U.S. trade deficit, reverse the trend rapidly, increasing imports and encourage foreign producers to operate in the United States rather than off our shores. The long-term benefits of using U.S. cement would outweigh any cost increases because nearly 50 percent of the price of U.S. products is recaptured through Federal, State, and local taxes.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that since the conference report and all the action that was taken on this surface transportation bill, OMB, the Office of Management and Budget in the White House, has even adopted a position that the imported cement which will be used on Federal highways does not have to move on U.S.-flag ships, as specified by the Cargo Preference Act of 1954.

That position, fortunately, is being opposed by the Department of Transportation, the Maritime Administration and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee here on Capitol Hill. But I suppose my question is why do we always have to fight for something to help America, Americans at work rather than just abide by the law and the will of the Congress? All of these laws set a precedent for including the Buy American provisions for cement in the Federal aid highway reauthorization highway legislation, H.R. 2, but it was not done and I am here today to remind my colleagues that there will be future authorizing legislation considered by Congress and I am prepared to work to reduce the trade deficit and promote the purchase of American made products by the U.S. Government for federally

funded projects. We must be in a position to act responsibly to the growing trade deficit and be prepared to pass legislation designed to promote American industry and labor. It is high time, Mr. Speaker, to stop selling off American industry.

Every Member must have the courage to stand up and fight unfair trading policies and help save jobs for Americans.

I thank the Speaker.

DEALING WITH TAX INCREASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENNY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] will be recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, when the Speaker of this House confided to Democratic colleagues last year that he was willing to "break the ice" and "float some ideas," he was not kidding. Upon his election last December as the new Speaker, Mr. WRIGHT, floated one such idea, suggesting to House Democrats that a modification could easily be made to the new tax reform bill. Feeling the need to be "honest with the American people" over the budget deficit, the Speaker's December proposal would delay for many so-called wealthy Americans the effective date of the bill's lower tax rates.

And less than 3 months later, Speaker WRIGHT did it again. This time, as a so-called positive step toward deficit reduction, he concluded that we ought to impose a transfer tax on the value of publicly traded stocks. The Speaker claimed that such a tax would produce about \$17 billion in revenues. Needless to say, that proposal was promptly orphaned as the White House and congressional Republicans denounced it and many Democrats in this body ran away from it.

Admittedly, the Speaker of the House displays some boldness just to utter the words "tax increase." When Walter Mondale did it in 1984, President Reagan laughed all the way to a 49-State victory. But now, he has dared to assert that because the President is strongly opposed to that infamous "T" word, the Congress will have to take the initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that before we get too carried away with any proposal to increase taxes, we ought to realize what effects such an increase would portend for the millions of Americans who would be forced to bear its greatest burden. With that in mind, I chaired a hearing last week of the Republican Study Committee on this very question—the question of whether or not Americans are, in fact, lining sufficiently the pockets of Uncle Sam.

It is interesting to note that since the November elections the debate over the issues of taxes and deficits

have been nearly completely one-sided. What we continue to hear and read is that the other party has this remarkable vision of achieving a prosperous America through a little tax hike here and a tiny tax hike there. From reading these accounts, one would think that the only reasonable, courageous, and statesmanlike persons in Washington are those who are willing to bite the tax increase bullet.

Additionally, whether the story is reported in the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post, or the New York Times, several basic themes are heard time and again—that Americans need to pay more for the cost of government; that the Congress cannot possibly meet the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction target; and, that our large Federal deficit was somehow caused single-handedly by President Reagan.

It should come as no surprise to many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that not everyone subscribes to such misguided thinking.

□ 1520

Rather, our hearing confirmed the belief that a tax increase would severely undermine productivity, economic growth and our competitiveness in the world marketplace.

Moreover, it would adversely affect the inflation rate, negatively impact on employment, and generally speaking, lower the standard of living for the vast majority of Americans.

Again, our reason for holding such a hearing should be clear. We figured that if the Democratic leadership in this House was willing to advocate the need for a tax hike, then it was incumbent on us, as responsible policymakers, to discuss what effects such a tax increase would have on society. I have taken this opportunity today to discuss in detail what our witnesses shared with us last week.

The first glimpse of the Speaker's taxation philosophy, as I mentioned previously, took form last December when he suggested that we delay the individual rate reductions promised through last year's massive overhaul of our Nation's tax code. As OMB Director Jim Miller noted last week, that proposal would have denied the promised 28 percent rate in 1988 to single taxpayers with incomes as low as \$27,000 and to all married taxpayers with incomes of more than \$45,000. Further, even though only about 11 percent of taxpayers will be immediately affected by 1988's extra 10-percent cut in the highest rate, that reduction has enormous indirect importance on all of us. Richard Rahn, chief economist of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, pointed out to our committee that upper income taxpayers obviously have a good deal more economic flexibility than do middle- or lower-income taxpayers. He maintains that

if tax rates are raised on upper income groups, then those taxpayers will likely substitute out of taxable activities. They will tend to consume their income rather than invest or save because the higher taxes will reduce the cost of consumption in terms of income foregone.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, those who aspire to rise to the top bracket in the future would surely be less likely to make the necessary efforts. Simply stated, governments cannot punish people for earning added income without also punishing the added production that creates that income.

In general, we must remember that the Tax Reform Act of 1986, although a great victory for the President, could not have passed without broad, bipartisan support in the Congress. Both parties signed on to this legislation early and pledged their support for it. We must not break that historic compact with the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose there are many of us in the Congress or elsewhere who have much admiration for those on Wall Street who illegally buy and sell stocks. Indeed, it is easy to seize the politically attractive issue of bashing such inside-traders. That fact, coupled with the notion that taxation should be based on one's ability to pay, perhaps led to the proposal that America's rich stockholders should be the "lucky" recipients of the Speaker's new stock transfer tax. Yet contrary to the claim that the burden will fall on the wealthy, statistics reveal that there are over 40 million shareholders in the United States. Those shareholders cover a broad range of economic classes, including the very people the Speaker is so intent on helping.

OMB Director Miller cited some astonishing figures last week that we really ought to keep in mind when contemplating such an onerous tax. According to the New York Stock Exchange in 1985, some 74 percent of all shareholders had annual incomes below \$50,000, and 24 percent had annual incomes below \$25,000. And Mr. Miller reminds us that those figures do not even address the fact that millions of Americans own stock indirectly through their pension funds, the Nation's leading non-Federal safety net. According to Richard Vedder, professor of economics at Ohio University, the private pension system is a major actor in the equity markets. As of 1983, 50 million working Americans received pensions, and 26 million of those—over half—earned less than \$15,000 a year in 1982.

Collaborating with these figures in an April 6 Washington Times article, economics columnist Warren Brookes noted that between pension funds and insurance policies—the two comprising more than 50 percent of all stock transactions—nearly \$1 trillion has

been added to their value under President Reagan.

Mr. Speaker, all security holders—no matter what their economic status—benefit from reduced rates and healthy stock market contributions. In February, for instance, Michigan taxpayers learned that the State's huge pension funds were nearly fully funded and at least 12 years ahead of schedule. This means that Michigan taxpayers could save as much as \$10 billion to \$12 billion in contributions between now and the year 2000. Still, Michigan's experience is not an aberration. It is happening to public and private pensions all over America, with estimates that by 1990 such pensions could produce an annual taxpayer windfall of \$15 billion to \$20 billion.

Turning back to the issue of the actual stock transfer tax, Mr. Miller used as an example the stock market's daily volume of trading. He correctly noted that a tax of one-half percent on buyers of stock and the same tax on the sellers would force investors to earn 1 percent more on their investments to realize the same after-tax return, since they would be taxed both when they bought and when they sold. Such a scenario would discourage all but the most profitable short-term transactions. He reminded us that most investors would have to hold their stock longer to realize a profit, which would seriously impede legitimate buying and selling.

Picking up on this same general theme was Paul Craig Roberts, the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy at Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies. Dr. Roberts said such a securities stock would fly in the face of fairness—the centerpiece of last year's tax reform bill. He suggested to the committee that a person who bought and sold the same stock several times would be taxed many times more than a different person who only conducted one sale, even if their capital gains were the same.

Dr. Roberts suggested further that it would not be difficult to predict what the response of investors and corporations would be to a stock transfer tax. Investors, argued Dr. Roberts, would hold their assets longer than is justified economically to avoid the tax, resulting in an inefficient investment mix. Professor Vedder concurred with that assessment by noting that the stock transfer proposal is particularly harmful since it is a tax on the mobility of resources. He admonished our committee that the movement of resources is what drives the economy, providing it with vitality and providing the means to meet changing wants of American consumers and investors.

In general, while higher taxes can come out of the pockets of stockholders in the short term, over a longer period higher business tax costs must

be tacked on to the prices charged for goods and services. As a result, higher business taxes become taxes on consumption and are not—as Speaker WRIGHT believes—based on one's ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate at this time to discuss the relationship between taxes and the Federal budget deficit. Before that, however, I would like to quote three Democratic leaders who have suggested that a tax increase is a necessary requisite for reducing the deficit. The first is from Speaker JIM WRIGHT, who was quoted in the March 6, 1987, Washington Times. He said:

In my judgement, there isn't any way to achieve the commanded reductions in the deficit without any revenues.

The second is a statement by Representative DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. Quoted in the October 23, 1986, Wall Street Journal, Representative ROSTENKOWSKI said:

Everyone knows we will eventually need a tax increase to reduce the deficit. But the increase in revenue should come through higher, progressive rates on income, not by a low, regressive tax on need.

□ 1530

And finally, Representative VIC FAZIO said the following in the Democrat's weekly radio address on March 21, 1987:

The honest fact is we need to continue spending restraint and we need to raise taxes if we want to cut the deficit over time and reestablish a firm economic foundation.

Mr. Speaker, both in 1982 and 1984, the Congress passed two exceedingly large tax increase bills designed to specifically reduce the deficit. According to their protagonists, these two bills should have reduced the deficit by \$68 billion in 1986. Yet the deficit is almost exactly the same as the CBO projected would be the case before the tax increases were passed in 1982.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at a comparison between congressional spending and tax collections. I would rather call it tax collections instead of revenues because the American people seem to accept the concept of revenues as something Government should have. When we say it is not revenues but tax collections, they understand it is coming from them.

Let us refer to this chart. In the 6-year period from fiscal year 1981 to fiscal year 1987 the receipts of the Federal Government rose 41 percent, or by \$243 billion. That means we are taking in \$243 billion at the end of that 5-year period additionally per year than we were at the beginning. What is the problem? Well, outlays rose by more. Outlays rose by 50 percent or by \$337 billion. So even though the trend is obviously up in terms of the blue line, which are revenues or, as we would like to call them, tax collec-

tions, spending is up even faster. Both of these numbers represent substantial increases, even allowing for inflation, and outlays increased faster than GNP during the same period of time. Outlays increased faster than tax collections. Outlays increased faster than the GNP grew during that same period of time. For every dollar in new revenues obtained Government spending rose by 1.39 percent, and the deficit has risen by \$94 billion.

Generally, speaking, it is infinitely more preferable to reduce the rate of growth in Federal spending and allow the deficit to fall as receipts increase with economic expansion than it is to raise taxes. Why do I say that? Increased taxation crowds out private activity just as borrowing does, but probably far more completely, quickly and effectively. A vote for higher taxes is a vote for bigger Government and a vote for shrinking the size and vitality of the private sector.

To sum up the issue of taxes and the deficit, I would like to quote from testimony our committee heard last week. Dr. Robert Tollison, professor of economics at George Mason University, said the following:

It is amazing that some Members of Congress still haven't figured out that the 1984 elections demonstrated conclusively that the taxpayers are totally fed up with the cycle of tax, tax, spend, spend, and tax some more. Representatives of both parties need to show some insight and imagination in dealing with the economic problems confronting us. Maybe politicians should begin thinking and acting like real people.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the biggest reason the Congress cannot effectively deal with the whole question of the budget deficit is its lack of institutional constraints. James Buchanan, the 1986 Nobel Prize laureate and professor at the public choice school of economics at George Mason University, has suggested that it is natural for Government to grow. It is because politicians are just like everybody else—they respond to incentives and for most of them the incentive is to increase funding, to increase the number of bureaucrats under them, to increase their power. Unlike the private sector, which has a bottom line and, therefore, incentives to reduce costs and please customers, Congress generally finds itself with no such market discipline and often in a monopoly situation.

This fact brings me to the final issue which I would like to address.

Although the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction plan was a step in the right direction, the Congress is clearly without the necessary incentives to effectively address the budget deficit. What we have as a result of no institutional incentives is a Congress without credibility and unfortunately a Congress without accountability, without accountability either to the executive branch or to the American people.

For starters, I would argue that, contrary to some statements made on the floor today that we should fear it, we need to provide the President with the real executive authority to exercise a line-item veto to reduce spending. Unlike most Governors, the President is placed in the untenable position of having to veto massive, all-inclusive appropriation bills which would, in many instances, endanger vital Government services. Such a change in the law would also enable the President to blue-pencil unnecessary or low-priority items. In that context, the President simply must have the ability to eliminate the excess waste and mismanagement that often results from congressional inaction or partisan squabbling.

Another key institutional tool that should be available to the legislative branch of Government in our quest to eliminate the Federal deficit is an amendment to the Constitution to balance the budget. Such a tool could very well alter the Government's addictive habit of easy credit card spending with no eye toward the day when the bills must be paid.

In the final analysis, most of the excuses raised for not enacting a constitutional mandate to balance the Federal budget seem to rest on a stated or implied preference for solving our deficit dilemma through what is called the political process—that is, through responsible action by the Congress. Yet that has been tried and found wanting, time and again. The last attempt to establish guidelines for such a political process, if we exclude the Gramm-Rudman bill, was the 1974 Budget Reform Act. Unfortunately, that act gave us nothing but mounting deficits and further discredit to the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the American people to restore accountability to the budget process. I have mentioned line-item veto legislation and the balanced budget amendment as positive steps in that direction. But perhaps Alexander Hamilton provided the best solution in the Federalist Papers. He said: "It is essential to the idea of a law that it be attended with a sanction; or, in other words, a penalty or punishment for disobedience." Unfortunately, few effective incentives currently confront Members of Congress.

To give Representatives and Senators a personal stake in the budget process, I have introduced H.R. 1038, the Congressional Pay for Performance Act. My bill would provide that, if all the appropriation bills for a given fiscal year are not approved by the start of that year, the permanent appropriation for congressional salary would be waived for that year. In addition, before the appropriation measure for the legislative branch could be considered, all of the other appropriation bills would have to be approved and

sent to the President. The legislation would therefore mandate that Congress accomplish its task before it receives its salary.

This would extend to Members of Congress and their staffs. It would say that, if we do not do the bare minimum of what is required in our job, getting the essential spending bills passed and sent to the President before the fiscal year begins, we would not get paid.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress needs a reminder that it depends on the public, not the public on the Congress. Pay-for-performance legislation will place such a reminder in a location that Senators and Representatives cannot forget. It is a place that most Americans cannot forget—their pocketbooks.

Mr. Speaker, I think as we begin this week's debate on the budget and we begin to hear the early siren songs—for instance, "let us just absolutely slam defense" or "let us just increase taxes on the American people"—it is good for us to remember that over the last 5 years we have increased taxes on the American people or—and this is another way of saying it—we have received taxes from the American people at an increasing rate of \$77 billion per year. The projections by OMB and virtually every other responsible organization are that we will, without increasing tax rates one bit, have an increase in tax collections by the Federal Government of approximately \$77 billion a year. We will have almost \$400 billion in additional tax collections by the 5th year on an annual basis over what we have right now.

□ 1540

Yet some will say we cannot live within our means. We not only cannot live within our present budget, we cannot live within our present budget, our present tax collections, plus \$400 billion additional by the end of 5 years.

I think that is nonsense. This chart clearly shows that revenues are up. They can talk about President Reagan's tax cut in 1981, yet revenues are up ever since he cut rates. Revenues are going to be up this year. We are going to take more money out of the pockets of the American people than has ever been taken before and yet we will still have a deficit.

Why? Because the red line continues to go up faster than the blue line. We do not have a deficit because the American people are fundamentally undertaxed, we have a deficit because the Congress that they elected to represent them continues to spend and spend and spend.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that as we begin our journey down the road to a solution to the present deficit problem, we look very, very carefully at

your easy proposal to increase taxes. I am afraid that we are caught in the syndrome where now it is a "tax-a-month club." The Speaker brings out a tax one month, and if we do not like that, he talks about another tax the next month. I was wondering what we were going to hear on the first of April this year. I guess we are going to wait until later in the month to hear the newest proposal for tax increases.

We have a budget that we are going to debate this week. The Democrats have presented a budget through the Budget Committee after denying cooperation to Republican members of that Budget Committee, and it has got about \$18 billion in new revenues, taxes. It does not tell us how those taxes are going to come about, but it seems to me encumbent upon Members of Congress to analyze those taxes and see what they are going to do for us.

Last year, we convinced the American people that we should have major tax reform in this country. We passed major tax reform and we promised the American people that we would do a few things for them. We would make it a little fairer. We tried to make it a little simpler. We probably did not achieve that. We would make it a little more equitable, and we would establish some certainty in the system. Here we are with the ink barely dry on the particular bill and we have already got the leadership on the other side of the aisle suggesting to us that what we have got to do is increase those rates.

I thought we had somewhat of a social compact with the American people last year when we voted for tax reform. We basically said we would make these changes on a massive scale in a comprehensive bill, and we promised not to do anything about it for some period of time. It seems to me we lose the credibility that we have with the American people if we were to alter that.

The other thing I would say is this: If you analyze this chart, it suggests that spending continues to go up no matter how much tax receipts or tax collections go up. It suggests one thing. Dealing with the Federal deficit is like dealing with the unfortunate problem of alcoholism in your family. If someone is suffering from alcoholism, you do not get them off alcohol by just offering them more. You are not going to get Congress off deficit spending by just offering them more tax revenues.

I think we ought to think about that as we begin this year in our discussion on the budget. Tax revenues have gone up the last 5 years; tax revenues will continue to go up the next 5 years by substantial amounts. It is up to Congress to try to deal with that challenge. It is up to Congress to try and work out a budget that makes sense that does not continue to add deficit

upon deficit on the backs of the American people, their children, and our grandchildren.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to address the issue of the growing Federal deficit and excessive Federal spending. I want to make two main points: First, the deficit is caused by too much spending; not by low taxes; and second, the process that produces these deficits is flawed.

The simple fact is that the reason we have a deficit is because of excessive Federal spending. The government does not need to raise new revenues. Under current law, revenues will rise an average of \$77 billion per year over the next 5 fiscal years. The amount of money available to be spent by the Federal Government will rise by over \$400 billion by 1992. Yet, this is not enough to the big spenders.

The President's budget plans do not drastically cut Government programs. The Federal Government would continue to spend billions of dollars on health, education, research, law enforcement, welfare, and other social programs. The big spenders are upset because the President's budget does not include tremendous increases in all of these areas. The Budget Committee budget includes the increases demanded by special interests, and plans for new taxes on the American people to pay for the programs that benefit only a few.

The American people are not undertaxed. The working men and women of our country should be able to keep more of what they earn. They should be able to decide how to spend or save or invest their hard-earned dollars. Of course, the people are willing to pay for our Nation's defense and many other programs, but the Government's appetite for tax revenues cannot always be fed. The people are not clamoring for more and new programs designed and run by the Federal Government, and paid for with higher taxes. They want the Government to use its existing tax revenue more wisely.

As we have all heard, "you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." The people are concerned when they hear accusations that the President wants to "cut" education or health or environmental spending. But, the people wise up when those making the charges then call for tax increases to pay for new programs. The American people are not taxed too much; the U.S. Congress spends too much.

Having said this, it is worthwhile to step back and look at the process under which Congress operates. We have the Budget Committee, Appropriations Committee, and Authorizing Committees. We debate and pass supplemental appropriations bills, "Emergency" supplementals, and run the Government by passing a continuing resolution.

As we discuss the Budget Committee budget, I must ask what role this will really play in the eventual spending decisions of our Government. Do the layers of committees, hearings, and special procedures make sense? Would the average American working family survive if they followed our policies? Obviously not. Average Americans do not have the power to raise taxes.

We must reform the budget process. We should implement a 2-year budget cycle. We ought to give the President the line-item veto. Our Constitution should be amended to require a balanced budget. The committee structure should be revised.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not taxed too much; the Government spends too much. Congress needs to act now to stop the growth of new spending, and to reform the budget process.

DOMESTIC ENERGY SUPPLY ACT OF 1987

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with many of my colleagues, including the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Republican Leader ROBERT MICHEL, and the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, Republican whip TRENT LOTT, and the distinguished gentleman from New York and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, NORMAN F. LENT, in cosponsoring the Domestic Energy Supply Act of 1987.

This Nation is blessed with an abundance of natural resources, including resources which can meet the energy needs of business and consumers. We are the world's second largest producer of crude oil. Although our known, economically recoverable reserves are a relatively modest 28 billion barrels, we have potentially significant but as yet untapped reserves underlying the Outer Continental Shelf and in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. There may be as much as 12 billion barrels of recoverable crude oil in the OCS and another 9 billion barrels in ANWR. Further, 300 billion barrels remain in the ground in areas already explored, and could be produced through enhanced recovery techniques.

Natural gas reserves in this country are plentiful and compare favorably with other producing nations' reserves. At the close of 1985, this Nation had as estimated 193 trillion cubic feet of proved reserves, with another 593 trillion cubic feet remaining to be discovered. In comparison, Canadian gas reserves are estimated at 100 trillion cubic feet and Mexican reserves are estimated to be 77 trillion cubic feet.

We are all aware of our vast reserves of coal. Domestic production of coal has increased steadily from over 400 million short tons in 1960, to nearly 1,000 million short tons in 1985 and may be expected to increase throughout this century.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the production of these vast energy resources is artificially constrained by Government. The Federal Government does not allow exploration for new reserves off of much of the coast of California. The Federal Government does not permit exploration and production of new reserves located in the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve. The Federal Government does not allow those who produce natural gas from so-called old gas wells to obtain market value for their product, and thus the Government en-

courages them not to produce such gas. The Federal Government, however, does allow interstate natural gas pipelines to deny producers and consumers access on nondiscriminatory terms to transportation services—access which is necessary to creating a true marketplace in gas. The Federal Government does not lease Federal lands for oil and gas production in an orderly and efficient manner—so that the energy potential of these reserves can be realized without harm to the environment.

Mr. Speaker, the result of this governmental interference is that this Nation, which is second to none in the depth and diversity of its natural resources and in its technological expertise to develop these resources consistently with the preservation and, indeed, the enhancement of environmental values, must rely to an increasing extent on imported supplies of energy. The United States was heavily dependent on crude oil imports during the seventies—we imported 46 percent of our crude oil needs in 1977. This dependency was reduced dramatically during the early years of the Reagan Presidency due to the decontrol of domestic oil prices and the natural market reaction to high prices—reduced consumption, increased production. Recently, however, our reliance on imported crude supplies has increased, from 25 percent of total consumption in 1985 to 38 percent in 1986. Many experts predict that a continuation of low oil prices throughout this decade would cause the crude import level to reach 50 percent by 1990.

Reasonable people may differ as to the ramifications of increased crude oil imports. Some view this as a serious threat to our Nation's security, while others are more sanguine about the short and long-term consequences of increased imports. Experts of the latter view point to the diversity of sources of imported crude oil and the presence of the strategic petroleum reserve as a safeguard against an import curtailment.

One point seems clear, however—the increase in imports which is due to declining domestic production is an increase in dependency which need not happen. And domestic production is definitely declining. In 1986, total U.S. production of crude oil declined by almost 800,000 barrels per day from the average in 1985. Much of this decline was no doubt due to the precipitous drop in oil prices last year. It is clear, however, that production of crude oil in this country has been in decline for a long time, with the discovery and production of the huge Prudhoe Bay reserve off the Alaskan North Slope only temporarily masking the long-term downward trend.

Mr. Speaker, what this Nation needs is an energy policy which will encourage, rather than deter, the development of our diverse and vast energy resources—and do so in a manner that protects and enhances our important environmental values.

Mr. Speaker, the Domestic Energy Supply Act constitutes such a policy. This legislation is intended to stimulate the productive forces in our economy by removing unwise and unnecessary governmental restraints and regulation. This approach rests on the premise that unleashing the genius and determination of American energy entrepreneurs is the key to ensuring over the short, and over the long

term, a balance between the supply, demand and price of energy.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to cite one example of how the Domestic Energy Supply Act will accomplish this purpose. Title I of the bill provides for the removal of remaining Federal controls on the price of natural gas at the wellhead. These controls would be removed from gas as the underlying contracts expired—so no legitimate, contractual rights and responsibilities would be disturbed. Price controls on natural gas, Mr. Speaker, have been proved to accomplish nothing other than to prevent producers, and consumers, from realizing the true market value of this valuable commodity. The Energy Information Administration estimates that continuation of Federal price ceilings on gas from wells drilled before the adoption of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 would cause the premature abandonment of those wells and a permanent loss of up to 34 trillion cubic feet of otherwise economically recoverable natural gas. This is enough gas to meet the total consumption of the United States for 2 years!

Mr. Speaker, it would be a true national tragedy for the Federal Government to be responsible for the waste of 34 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Natural gas is an environmentally clean, domestic energy resource—precisely the kind of resource this Nation should be developing and using, not wasting. Enactment of the Domestic Energy Supply Act of 1987 would prevent this huge waste from occurring.

There are several other titles to this legislation which are in the same spirit of title I. For brevity's sake, I have attached a summary of these titles for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of rhetoric in the last few years about the coming "energy crisis." Many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have argued that the Republican Party does not care about the energy security of our Nation, or that we are complacent about it. They claim that we Republicans lack an energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. There are many significant, innovative and environmentally sensitive measures that can be undertaken to stimulate domestic energy production and ensure adequate supplies of energy at reasonable cost for consumers. Many of these ideas have been pushed tirelessly for several years by Republicans and even by a few Democrats. The problem has been that not enough of our friends in the majority party have supported these proposals to allow them to be enacted into law. In toto, these proposals would amount to a superb and effective national energy policy. The Domestic Energy Policy Act of 1987 constitutes that policy, and I commend it to my colleagues.

TITLE-BY-TITLE SUMMARY OF DOMESTIC ENERGY SUPPLY ACT OF 1987

TITLE I—NATURAL GAS

This title would immediately decontrol all wellhead prices covered in new and renegotiated contracts. Other wellhead prices would be decontrolled as the underlying contracts expired. Thus, this is a phased out decontrol of prices.

The title would compel interstate pipelines to transport gas on a nondiscriminatory basis for any person. Bypass of local

distribution companies would be prohibited if such companies offered transportation services on terms comparable to those of the interstate pipeline.

TITLE II—ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

These provisions draw on Mr. Young's bill, H.R. 1082, and would authorize exploration and development of oil and gas reserves in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge ("ANWR").

TITLE III—WINDFALL PROFITS TAX

This title would repeal the Windfall Profits Tax.

TITLE IV—ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING

These provisions draw on the bill introduced last Congress by Senator Bumpers. A two-tier leasing system would be instituted, with an initial round of competitive bidding followed, if necessary, by a lottery.

There are two differences between the language in this title and that contained in the Bumpers' legislation. First, the flat royalty rate of 12½ percent, contained in the Bumpers' bill, is reduced to 10 percent in title IV. Second, unlike the Bumpers' bill, there is no minimum bid requirement.

TITLE V—LIMITED ANTITRUST IMMUNITY FOR SMALL NATURAL GAS PRODUCERS

These sections would allow independent gas producers to enter into cooperatives, to enhance their ability to compete in the market, without incurring antitrust liability. To qualify for this limited antitrust protection, the cooperative must not be for the purpose of fixing prices.

TITLE VI—OIL PIPELINE DEREGULATION

This title would deregulate the rates of common carrier pipelines that transport oil and oil products. If a petitioner could show that the pipeline possesses market power to control prices, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission could reimpose rate regulation.

TITLE VII—ENHANCEMENT OF COAL EXPORTS TO JAPAN

This title directs the President to enter into negotiations with the Japanese Government to implement the 1983 Reagan-Nakasone "Joint Statement on Energy Cooperation", in which the Japanese agreed to expand their use of competitively priced U.S. coal. The President would be directed to report to Congress on the progress of these negotiations and recommend legislative solutions, if necessary.

TITLE VIII—METHANOL PROGRAM

This title is based on the bill from last year—H.R. 3355 ("Methanol Energy Policy Act")—which was cosponsored by Congressmen Moorhead, Dannemeyer, Sharp, Markey and others. It would direct the Energy Secretary to ensure that the government use methanol powered vehicles. It would also provide for demonstration of methanol trucks and buses. Credits against CAFE requirements would be given to auto manufacturers that make methanol vehicles.

TITLE IX—PROHIBITION OF MORATORIA ON LEASING OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

This title is intended to preclude any absolute moratorium on leasing tracts for oil and gas development on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, many Members have spent a significant amount of time in this body stating their concern over the depressed state of our oil and

gas industry. While I'm sure that the producers appreciate our sympathetic words, little is being done to encourage development of our valuable resources. It is clearly time for action.

Today, I have joined a number of my colleagues in introducing legislation which would prove that the concern we've expressed for the oil and gas industry is not merely political rhetoric. Deregulation of natural gas, repeal of the windfall profits tax and opening up vital reserves for exploration and development are just a few ways the Domestic Energy Supply Act of 1987 will substantively address the problems of the producer. More importantly, it would do so without creating market distortions holding many dangerous economic implications.

The health of our oil and gas industry is not a regional concern—its impact on the security of this Nation affects each of us. While we may currently be reaping the benefits of lower oil and gas prices, they won't last forever. Experts estimate that, given current trends, we will be dependent on foreign sources for more than 50 percent of our oil by the turn of the century. With this in mind, I would urge all of my colleagues to carefully consider this legislation and support its passage.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I cosponsored the Domestic Energy Supply Act of 1987. The bill has been authored by the Republican members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, and is endorsed by the Republican leadership in both the House and the Senate.

This legislation contains a number of provisions which are designed to remove unnecessary Government regulation on our domestic energy producers. These provisions include the deregulation of natural gas, exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, repeal of the windfall profit tax, and the prohibition of a moratoria on leasing of the Outer Continental Shelf.

I fully support the deregulation of all natural gas. This legislation provides us with a responsible compromise toward this goal by allowing us to decontrol natural gas as contracts expire or are renegotiated.

I also support the provision authorizing exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. If we are really serious about this country's energy security, we must explore what may be the last giant oil field in the United States.

I also call for the repeal of the windfall profit tax. This tax has imposed a \$45 billion burden on the American energy industry over the past 7 years. Now that no one is making a "windfall" this tax should be immediately repealed. This tax still imposes substantial regulatory burdens on American oil companies.

The bill also demonstrates strong support for offshore oil and gas leasing and development. It is about time that we took a strong stand against dilatory tactics that inhibit development of needed oil and gas reserves off the California coast.

Although this bill does not solve all the problems confronting the energy industry, it is a strong first step.

THE ALTERNATIVE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order this afternoon for the purpose of briefly describing to my colleagues the budget that this Member from California will be offering probably on Thursday of this week. I will just take a few moments to show how the budget proposal that some of us put together, that I will have the privilege of offering, differs from the work product of the Democrat majority in the House because I think that contrast should be made.

We have heard a lot of talk in the last year or so about the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target for the deficit. For example, in 1986, the target deficit was supposed to have been reduced to \$172 billion. Well, if anybody wants to read the publication of the OMB for 1988 fiscal year, on page 97 you will find the Truth in Debt Act published there very clearly.

Our target for the deficit in that fiscal year 1986, was \$172 billion. In fact, we borrowed \$285 billion that year and added it to the national debt. In this fiscal year, 1987, our target under Gramm-Rudman is \$144 billion. We are scheduled to borrow an additional \$208 billion and add to the national debt. In fiscal year 1988, which will be the budget proposal we will take up the day after tomorrow and also tomorrow perhaps, the Gramm-Rudman target is \$108 billion. In fact, we are scheduled to borrow \$189 billion.

What this means is that we will have borrowed in just these 3 fiscal years, 1986, 1987, and 1988, better than two-thirds of a trillion dollars which we have added to our national debt. The national debt, as of the end of this fiscal year, will be about \$2.3 trillion.

We have added over a trillion dollars to the national debt in the last 5 years. It took us from the beginning of the history of our Republic in 1789 until 1980 to get a trillion dollars, and it does not take someone with a Ph.D. in economics to realize that something is fundamentally wrong with the budget process or the Federal policy on monetary policy that causes these deficits to just grow and grow and grow and exist. Seemingly, the political process is unable to do anything about them.

That is the unique aspect of this budget because there is reconciliation language in it which makes very clear that we will seek to adopt certain options in the budget proposal that will reduce the deficit the most that any of them have proposed. That is, of the budget proposals that have been made. It is, I think, obvious to all of us that there are two ways that you can reduce the deficit. One is by cutting

spending and the other is by increasing taxes.

My colleague from California, Mr. LUNGREN, talked about the option of increasing taxes which I think is the wrong way to go because we are taxing at the rate of about 19 percent of our GNP and the problem is we are spending too much at about 24 percent of the GNP.

There are four differences in the budget that I will talk about that will reduce the deficit the most and will actually get us to the projected target of \$108 billion for fiscal year 1988. The first one is it will implement recommendations of the Congressional Budget Office totaling some \$10.2 billion. This is not in the Democrat version of the budget. In other words, it is a proposal to cut spending by that amount and Members will have an opportunity of voting up or down on whether they want to implement recommendations of the Congressional Budget Office to achieve savings in that amount, specifically \$10.2 billion.

The second area deals with implementing recommendations of the Grace Commission, some of them totaling \$11.9 billion. These are not found in the Democrat version of the budget. In other words, again reducing the budget by cutting spending, not by increasing taxes.

The third feature deals with what the National Bureau of Economic Research recommends for us that we can increase revenues by approximately \$15 billion in fiscal year 1988 by tax amnesty. Now, anybody in this country that has been paying their taxes every year says, "Why in the world should you give amnesty to somebody who has not paid their taxes?" That is a good question, but we realize that there is a large underground economy in this country, and some of us believe that if we had a 3-month window, say, from July to September, of this coming fiscal year, that would be next year in the calendar year, persons would have an opportunity on a one-time basis of paying up their taxes without civil or criminal fraud penalties.

The estimates vary all over the place as to what revenue this would bring in. They range from \$17 to \$47 billion in one fiscal year. Most of the estimates range between \$10 and \$20 billion, and that is why, for the purpose of this budget proposal, I have adopted the recommendations of \$15 billion, which is mid-point in that range.

The fourth area of substantial difference I think deals with an area that it is time we discuss, namely monetary reform of the basic structure of the Federal Government itself. Of the projected trillion-dollar budget-plus that is planned for fiscal year 1988, about 20 percent, or just a little less than

\$200 billion is projected in interest on the national debt.

□ 1550

Today 43 percent of all general revenue funds collected from the existing tax system goes to pay interest on the national debt. Just 4 or 5 years ago that percentage was just 23 percent.

The percentage of revenue that is undesignated Federal funds falling into the general fund going to interests on the national debt is growing more and more each year. If we continue on the course for the balance of the next 10 years the way we have gone the last 5 years, we may get to the point where all of the income to the general fund will be required to pay interest on the outstanding debt. At that point we would have to admit there is nothing available for any other purpose except to pay interest on the debt and we would have the choice of national bankruptcy or trying to continue to live the fiction that we can go on on that basis on some purpose insofar as the future is concerned.

When I talk about monetary reform, I am talking about recognizing that we are not using in the international monetary system of the Western World a vital important resource that is currently lying around doing nothing in terms of being involved in the budget process of the country; namely, the gold supply of the world.

We estimate that there are 100,000 tons of gold held in this world. About 40,000 tons are in Government hands, around 60,000 tons in private hands around the world. Each of those owners of gold in the private sector have to pay about a half a point a year to have that gold stored. That is a negative impact on their assets because they have to pay somebody to store it and they have to pay insurance on keeping it safely.

Under the proposal that we are talking about, the U.S. Treasury would say to the world that we will take your gold and we will pay interest on those gold holdings or gold ingots that come to the Treasury of the United States at 1 percent a year.

We believe that this is a magnet of attraction to the holders of gold in the world whereby currently they have to pay about half a point to own the gold. If the U.S. Government with the integrity it has in international commerce promises to the world that we will pay the holders of gold 1 point a year to bring us their gold and for that we will give them a bond, a 40-year bond, payable in gold each year, that is the annual interest cost of 1 percent would be payable in gold each year. We would take that gold that is brought to the shores of this country and we would turn it into gold coins and we would sell those coins in the international monetary markets of the

world for cash and use that cash to retire the short-term indebtedness as it accrues.

The data indicates that today we have roughly \$1.1 trillion of our national debt coming due in the next year; that is, within the next 12 months we will have \$1.1 trillion of our national debt come due that has to be refinanced by some means. About \$561 billion of that debt is in private hands. It will have to be refinanced. About \$617 billion is held by trust accounts of the Federal Government.

We have calculated on the proposal that I have made that if we refinance the debt that exists by issuing gold backed bonds of 1 percent a year, and by the way the effective rate on this \$625 billion of debt in private hands is now about 7 percent as the average rate for that portion of the debt and if we refinance that at 1 percent we are driving an average cost out of the interest cost expense for their financing of that debt for fiscal year 1988 of some \$19 billion.

Over the course of the next 10 years through the issuance of these gold-backed bonds that I have described, we would have the alternative of refinancing the national debt where the average interest expense is about 9½ percent, about \$200 billion on \$2.3 trillion of outstanding national debt, and we calculated that the interest cost reduction for 1988 would be \$19 billion; for 1989 it would be \$47 billion, and for 1990 it would be \$61 billion. This is the reduction in the interest cost expense of maintaining the national debt.

It is my feeling that the Nation is ready for a debate at the Presidential level certainly in the upcoming Presidential election next year. Certainly it is timely that we in the House of Representatives begin to understand what it means to all of us in this country, what it means to people in the Western World where we continue on the policy of having our dollars backed by nothing.

Back in 1968 this Nation severed the link between the dollar and gold and for the ensuing 19 years we have been experiencing what that means to all of us, ups and downs, recessions, growth periods, inflationary periods, spikes in the interest rate, traumatic events in the monetary system of the world, witnessing today the Secretary of the Treasury wandering around the world with a box of Band-Aids attempting to shore up the hemorrhaging international banking situation, a major debt crisis in Mexico and Brazil and Argentina, a trade war existing between this Nation and Japan; these are symptoms of the underlying cause of monetary instability. These are symptoms of nothing more than a dollar backed by nothing.

This Nation had better understand that if we are to have monetary stabil-

ity, if we are going to reduce this trade war rather than exacerbate it, if we are going to solve the overburdened problem of this world, we are going to have to drive down the cost of interest, and you drive down the cost of interest and again we use the resource that over time has proved the means of assuring lenders of capital that when they get their money back at the expiration of the loan, that money will buy what it bought when it was lent. That is the definition of honest money. This country has not had that recourse of honest money since 1968 for the 19 years that ensued, and we citizens know today what this means to us.

Any Member in this House today will want to know what this means to him or her, if you are paying 9 percent, which is the current fixed term 15 or 30 year mortgage rate quoted by most lenders today, that is about 4 points more than your parents paid when they bought their homes and participated in the family dream of America. Why is that 4 percentage point premium in the lending rate? Because the lenders of capital are fearful of a resumption of inflation. That is what restoring honest money in this country means to anyone; namely, driving down interest rates, whether you have a college student loan, whether you want to start a business, whether you are a home owner or whether you are the U.S. Government.

The major option of the budget that I will propose is reducing the interest cost and maintaining the national debt. As I say, the figure for 1988 is \$19 billion and the other figures that I have quoted. I think it is an option that needs to be argued and discussed.

I frankly can say that I suspect there will be less tears in the political sense shed for sending less money to the bankers in New York City in interest on the national debt than will be shed in this place by having to vote to reduce numerous spending proposals that sooner or later we will be facing as Members of Congress if we ever are to achieve the goal of a balanced budget in the U.S. Government.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT, THE MARINES, AND THE SOVIET EMPIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENNY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today on the State Department, the Marines, and the Soviet empire.

I want to focus on basic lessons to be re-learned once again about the nature of the Soviet empire, the dangers to

American security and survival, and the nature of our State Department.

I think it is very good that President Reagan announced today that we will not occupy the new Embassy in Moscow until he is sure that it is secure from Soviet spying and that he also said the Russians would not be allowed to move into their new office tower until we have a facility in Moscow; but I thought it was ironic that in the very Associated Press wire page that included the Reagan story, they also had in the day book a luncheon speech on "The Peace Process: Recent Developments and Future Prospects," citing a senior advisor in the State Department as the speaker, because I think it has been precisely the misunderstanding of the Soviet concept of peace which has led the United States into the mess we now find ourselves in. That mess is at least in part a public relations problem, although it is entitled, for example, in one Newsweek article, "The Worst Security Breach in Embassy History."

It should never have occurred. A number of people have come up to me and said, "How could it be marines?" They had lost faith because there were marines involved, as though somehow marines were invulnerable to human temptation.

Others have said, how could we be so unwise in the way we supervise them?

But what is happening as this particular scandal starts to unfold is that people who focus first on the marine part, which is the human interest involving sex and young men and therefore fits the soap opera style of much of modern television news, they then expand into the Embassy story, which has been going on now for several years and which is itself an example of almost unbelievable naivete, and then finally having first blamed the marines and then blamed the State Department, they focus on the Soviets.

□ 1600

I think that it is this sequence of starting by blaming our young men rather than asking the question: What is it we can learn about the Soviet empire from the intensity of their effort to spy on America? What does it tell us that we have had spy scandal after spy scandal, that, for example, the French are in the process of expelling Soviet spies right now? What does this tell us about the Soviet empire, about Gorbachev's dictatorship, and about the distinction between propaganda and reality?

Jean Kirkpatrick talked several years ago about "Blame America First" Democrats when she talked about the San Francisco Democrats in her speech on foreign policy. She said that there are some people who have a tendency to always blame America first.

Let me suggest that by focusing too narrowly on the marines that we engage in that very process. The Soviets work very, very hard to penetrate American secrets. It should not surprise us that in their own national capital they would work very, very hard to penetrate our Embassy.

What should surprise us is how systematically naive the State Department has been, and to some extent this has been a bipartisan naivete going back to the Nixon-Kissinger agreements on détente when we gave the Soviets an absurd deal on Embassy sites.

Let me explain. In order to appease Brezhnev in the 1970's, the Nixon administration agreed that we would let the Soviets have a hilltop in Washington for their Embassy, a site which technically allows them to look at the Foreign Service Institute, the White House, and the CIA electronically, while we would accept a swamp in Moscow, a site which was basically protected by its geography from being able to look at anything.

So in effect we were giving the Soviets a very high-value site to spy on America, and we were accepting from the Soviets a very low-value site which would prevent us from learning much about the Soviet Union.

That was accepted in the early 1970's, in the interest of somehow being more reasonable and being nice to the Russians, because if only we are nice to them, they will be nice to us.

Now we should have learned that this kind of behavior simply does not pay off, that in fact when the Russians see weakness, they pressure us and they assume that we are just frankly foolish.

Let me give an example of this from a superb new book called "The Bear in the Back Yard—Moscow's Caribbean Strategy" by Timothy Ashby. I am quoting from pages 69 and 70, where he says:

In May 1972, shortly before the summit meeting between Nixon and Brezhnev the same month, a Soviet Golf-II—nuclear submarine—was deployed to Cuba along with a submarine tender. The deployment was timed to make a U.S. response as difficult as possible, taking place during the final sessions of the bilateral negotiations to prevent unintentional confrontations between warships at sea.

He goes on to say on page 70:

Four months after the signing of SALT I—amid renewed Western enthusiasm for détente as well as Richard Nixon's 1972 presidential campaign as the "Peace President"—the Kremlin took its next step of incremental power projection in the Caribbean. In September, Soviet Tu-95 Bear D reconnaissance flights off the U.S. eastern seaboard began regular use of Cuban airfields. Again, the U.S. government failed to make any protest to the Soviet Union, saying that "only the movement of large numbers of such planes into Cuba on a permanent basis would be a problem." By the following year, twelve Tu-95 deployments to

Cuba had been made, while Soviet submarines had completed twenty-two port calls to the island—the largest number of such visits to any country outside the USSR.

Or again, because this has been a bipartisan blindness to Soviet strategies:

The SALT II negotiations during the early part of 1979 as well as preparations for President Carter's summit meeting with Leonid Brezhnev that June must have appeared to the Kremlin as a suitable atmosphere in which to accelerate Soviet influence in the Caribbean region. Grenada fell to a [Cuban]-assisted Marxist coup d'état in March 1979 and Nicaragua was taken over by another Cuban-supported, pro-Soviet revolutionary movement in July. While Carter and Brezhnev were meeting at Vienna in June, the Soviet Union was delivering two squadrons of twenty-four An-26 Curl transport aircraft to Cuba. The An-26 is a tactical transport capable of carrying thirty-eight combat troops or five tons of cargo for a distance of six hundred miles. These aircraft were almost immediately put to use ferrying military supplies to Costa Rica for delivery to the Sandinistas during their final offensive, demonstrating the direct application of military support to "epicenters" of the global struggle as an element of Soviet Caribbean strategy.

Now why am I citing developments in the Caribbean as they relate to today's spy scandal? For this reason: When we talk détente, we mean it. When we say, "Let's have good relations," we mean it. When the Soviets talk détente, it is in their own system a strategy for getting the West to relax while they go ahead and do whatever they want to.

Here we have, for example, Gorbachev saying, "Oh, I really want to have a more open society, and by the way my open society wants to seduce your marines, spy on your Embassy, and in order to make things easier in the future, why don't we just build our spy microphones into the wall of your Embassy rather than try to do it from the outside?"

Then we are shocked. Again and again for the last 20 years we pretend, we convince ourselves, we deceive ourselves into believing that the Soviet empire is going to be reasonable. We then are surprised when the Soviet empire turns out to be unreasonable, and we get shocked.

It is as though you were living next door to an alligator which had a tendency to bite your hand if you put it next to the alligator's mouth, but every couple of years you convinced yourself that it was not really an alligator, it was really a pet teddy bear, and so every couple of years you would reach over to pet the teddy bear, and it would take off your hand. Then you would get resurprised because it acted like an alligator.

The Soviet empire is a dictatorship committed to undermining and isolating the United States and committed to setting up a situation in which ultimately the Soviets have absolute power and we are helpless. That has

been said by them. Lenin said it, Stalin said it, Khrushchev said it, Brezhnev said it, Kosygin said it. It is consistent.

Now, if you knew that you were competing with a dictatorship which wanted to spy on you, probably you would start out and say, "What will happen if we send young men by themselves to live in Moscow?" Now you do not have to be very sophisticated to come to the conclusion that whether they are marines or they are sailors or they are Army or Air Force, 19-, 20-, and 21-year-old young men are going to at least be potentially interested in young ladies. And if you send them there by themselves in an isolated society, you are establishing temptation.

Let us go a step further. What if we start having the State Department talk about this wonderful new opening up of the Soviet Union and how we should get to know each other better, and let us say you are a private or a corporal in the Marine Corps and you read this stuff. You say to yourself, "Oh, maybe I should get to know Russians better, too."

The Russians as part of the new friendship happen to have available young ladies who are attractive who are willing to get to know young Americans.

□ 1610

Now, are you as a marine supposed to reject your country's new openness, or should you indicate your willingness to have détente at a personal level?

Let us go a step further. Let us look at the fact that it is the State Department that supervises the Marines, not the Marine Corps. So instead of having a relatively tough military discipline, you now have a State Department diplomat who says, gosh, I am not sure that is wise. And those of us who have served in the Marines or the Army know that is probably not how it would have been described to you by your commanding officer.

Then suddenly we are shocked because we discover that 3 or 4 young men or 5 or 10 young men have succumbed to human weakness. Now we do not stop and say to ourselves how angry should we be with the Russians for systematically setting up efforts to entrap young Americans. How angry should we be with our indoctrination that we do not make clear to our seniors that this is a dangerous society, that every person is a potential spy, that every person who talks to Americans is a potential KGB agent. How angry should we be with the State Department for not focusing intelligently on managing these young men? It is far too easy to focus on the young men.

But now comes the second phase because now we start paying attention to the Embassy, and the Embassy is an

absolute disgrace. First of all, it is a disgrace because we were dumb in the early 1970's, and we accepted a trade that makes no sense. Frankly, we now have an excuse to get out of the trade.

I agree with Congressman BROOMFIELD of Michigan who has suggested that we ought to basically buy back the Russian Embassy from them in Washington, because it is on a very good hill and we can sell it or use it as a Government building. And we should give them back or sell back to them the American Embassy in Moscow, which is in a swamp, which was built with Russian prefabricated components which include in them spy devices. And we ought to say let us start over. We are not going to give you the best facility for spying in Washington. You are just not going to get it. And we expect to get at least as good a site in Moscow as you get in Washington.

Let me go a stage further. The notion of having to be secure in the Soviet Union goes back a very long way. Anyone who reads "The Wise Men" will recognize that all through the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's there was an assumption that the Soviets were trying to spy on us. There was an assumption that of course they would listen in to the conversations and, of course, they would try to find out what we were doing.

I think what is surprising is the degree to which the American State Department systematically rejects reality when it comes to the Soviet empire. The fact is that by Soviet doctrine they are in a state of war with us or in a state of nonpeace. From their standpoint, anything goes, any trick is legitimate, and whether it is spying electronically or spying with a human being, that is totally appropriate behavior.

I think we should relax and accept that is the way the Soviet empire is. We should then act accordingly.

Now I would suggest that if you look at the negotiations by which the United States allowed the Soviets to build parts of the Embassy, you have to ask yourself who was in charge and what were they thinking about. How could we possibly say to our leading enemy on the planet, how would you like a chance to plant all of the microphones and bugging devices you would like, how would you like a chance to know all the blueprints of the Embassy, how would you like a chance to plant your spies in our building, and then be shocked that they took all of the chances we gave them?

Furthermore, notice the language coming out of Russia right now, because we have been naive and innocent in dealing with the Soviet empire. We now are being laughed at by the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman. He was making jokes last week about our marines. He is making jokes about our

Ambassador and our Secretary of State, and frankly, I cannot blame the Soviets for being arrogant. After all, how could you sit in a room with Gorbachev and explain an American competitor that gives you the best site in Washington and accepts a dumb site in Moscow, that allows you to build their Embassy, and then allows you to send your spies to work so that the United States was, in effect, paying the Soviet Union to spy on the United States. Think about this. We were accepting, to work in the Embassy, people we now concede were spies.

Who was paying them? The American taxpayer. So thanks to our State Department, we now have American tax-paid Russian spies working in our Embassy to seduce our marines, and then we get mad at the marines. Is it any wonder the Soviet press spokesman makes fun of America? Do we not look a little like the Keystone Cops? Can you imagine a spy movie in which the United States was paying the Russian spy to work in the American Embassy to spy on the Americans? We cannot believe it. We would think Woody Allen had done it, but instead George Shultz did, and I think we have to confront this.

The United States State Department is currently incapable of dealing seriously with the Soviet Union, because the culture of the American State Department rejects the reality of the Soviet empire. The State Department is not tough enough, it is not firm enough, it is not realistic enough about the nature of Leninism, the nature of the Communist dictatorship, and the nature of the Soviet empire, whether it is in the Caribbean, in Central America, or it is in Moscow. Clearly we should learn some lessons about the marines, and I think the biggest lesson we need to learn is that in dangerous posts in terms of spying you should always send married couples, and you should have facilities for those couples. So when we renegotiate the Embassy site, it seems to me, we should insist on an Embassy large enough that our marines can live onsite with their spouses. But that also means, by the way, we need an Embassy large enough that the Americans who work in the Embassy have adequate facilities, and it should mean that we would insist on an American-staffed Embassy with no Soviet nationals so that there are no American-paid Soviet spies.

In addition, there are lessons we should learn about the State Department. We should learn that the State Department needs to be fundamentally reformed, that we need to overhaul it from top to bottom, that the weaknesses that keep cropping up, whether they are weaknesses in negotiating in Central America, or weaknesses in negotiating on international trade, or

weaknesses in protecting our marines, or weaknesses in negotiating with the Soviet empire, goes to the very heart of how the State Department professional staff views the world.

Let me suggest to you that a State Department incapable of negotiating a safe Embassy is probably a State Department incapable of negotiating a safe arms treaty. It frankly frightens me to think that the same mentality and same mind set which gave away the store over where to site the Embassy, gave away the store over allowing Russian spies to work in the Embassy, and gave away the store over allowing the Russians to build the Embassy, is now going to be in Geneva negotiating with the Soviet Union on arms control. Why would we assume if they were incompetent on little things they are going to be competent on big things? I would suggest anybody who knows much about life knows just the opposite is true. If in fact they misunderstand the Soviet empire that they made this big an error, then it is very likely that on more important matters they would make an even bigger error.

But let me go finally to lessons to learn about the Soviet system. I think this has to be at the heart of our news coverage, of our response as politicians and of the Government's response. The real lesson to be learned about the spying scandal and the Embassy scandal is that the world is dangerous. The real lesson to be learned is that the Soviet empire really does not like the United States and intends to do something about it. The real lesson to learn is that there is no trust between a dictatorship and a democracy, and by definition there cannot be any trust because a dictatorship's values and goals are the exact opposite of a democracy's values and goals. The real lesson to learn is that the Gorbachev who appears on television smiling is the same man who assigns the spies to seduce our marines.

□ 1620

The Gorbachev who talks about opening up is the same man whose secret police planted bugs in the Embassy walls; the Gorbachev who attempts to appear to be reasonable employs the foreign ministry spokesman who last week was ridiculing the United States and making fun of the weaknesses of the American people and the American Nation; that there is an arrogance to the deliberate systematic Soviet deception of the West. And when you back off and you say to yourself, "What does this lesson teach us?" I would suggest it teaches us first of all that any agreement we ever make with the Russians we had better be able to verify onsite because they will systematically deceive us. It should teach us, second, that the great value of the strategic defense initiative is it relies on American technology,

not Russian good will and American technology is a much safer, much safer thing to rely on than Russian good will.

Let me suggest to the Reagan administration: This scandal, this page one story is an opportunity, it is an opportunity to remind the American people about the dangers of the Soviet empire, it is an opportunity to tighten up on our management of the State Department, it is an opportunity to create some more realism in the U.S. Congress about the importance of security and the importance of stopping spies.

But it is also a danger. If the State Department convinces Secretary Shultz that business as usual is more important than solving these problems, then we have a very grave problem and the Reagan administration will bear the burden.

I would suggest to Secretary Shultz, if he is determined to go to Moscow next week, he should on April 13 say to the Soviets, "We want a new site for our Embassy. We want a new building we are going to build ourselves. We want enough facilities that we can house all of the Americans that work there and we will not accept any Soviet nationals in our Embassy as workers."

I think he should also say to the Soviets, "We are not going to let you have the Embassy on the hill, it is too good a spy center for you to spy on the Central Intelligence Agency, on the State Department, and on the White House. We are going to buy back that building at cost and we are going to give you a new site that is not a location for spying." And he should be very, very firm for this reason: I do not think dictatorships are impressed by weakness. I think that weakness leads to arrogance and arrogance leads to mistakes.

The greatest danger in Gorbachev's current game plan would be for him to come to believe that we are so weak and we are so foolish that he can take very large risks and we will do nothing. Those of us old enough to remember the Cuban missile crisis which was a point in American history when we came closest to nuclear war, will remember that it was Khrushchev's underestimation of John F. Kennedy, Khrushchev's belief that Kennedy was weak which led to that crisis.

Gorbachev is still a relatively new dictator. He is still learning about the United States.

In the next few months, we are going to teach him that we are so foolish we will accept a bad Embassy on a bad site with Soviet spying and call that business as usual. He will learn that we are so foolish that when we learn that the State Department is totally incapable of protecting our secrets, we do nothing to reform it. He will learn that we are so foolish that

we want a treaty so badly, we want arms control so desperately that no matter what the Russians do to insult us, we will keep crawling back to Moscow asking them to be nice to us.

And if that happens, we are then in a very, very dangerous situation because then we will have a young, aggressive Soviet dictator who may decide that big risks are reasonable because the Americans are very foolish and very short-sighted and very weak.

On the other hand, if we stand up to him on little things, and this Embassy is on the scale of great powers a very little thing, if we say to him that while we are angry with our Marines, we are much angrier with his KGB secret police; if we say to him that while we are irritated with our State Department's incompetence, we are not going to accept it anymore and we must have a new Embassy; if we say to him, "Your KGB made the mess when you planted the bugs in the Embassy. We are not going to accept the consequences of your mess. You are going to have to clean it up." Then Gorbachev will learn, I think, that he has to deal with a very firm and very serious United States indeed and then he will be much more cautious and much more careful.

The choice is President Reagan's. If President Reagan cleans up the State Department, moves to new toughness with the Soviet empire and requires it to clean up the Embassy mess it has made, then I think he will have the country strongly behind him.

If, on the other hand, President Reagan allows Secretary Shultz and the State Department to convince him that nice words with Gorbachev are more important than reality, then I think he will find the country very dissatisfied and very unhappy and very determined to force those changes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENNY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON) to revise and

extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOORHEAD, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. McEWEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DANNEMEYER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOUCHER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PEASE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. PEASE, for 60 minutes, on April 8.

Mr. PEASE, for 60 minutes, on April 9.

Mr. PENNY, for 30 minutes, on April 10.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ROGERS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. VENTO, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,964.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. JEFFORDS.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. GALLO in two instances.

Mr. RITTER.

Mr. LATTA.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. LOTT in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. BERMAN in two instances.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. ASPIN.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 514. An act to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to establish an incentive bonus for the successful placement of certain employable dependent individuals, to add an enriched program option of employment and training for AFDC/SSI youth and to the summer youth employment and training program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 825. An act to amend and extend certain laws relating to housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

S.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution disapproving the certification by the President under section 481(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 8, 1987, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the fourth quarter of calendar year 1986 and the first quarter of calendar year 1987 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1986

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jeffrey Farrow, staff	11/1	11/8	French Polynesia		707.00				270.10		977.10
	11/8	11/10	Fiji		188.00				8.86		196.86
	11/14	11/15	Western Samoa		75.00		3,670.56		9.01		3,754.57
Manase Mansur, staff	10/31	11/4	French Polynesia		404.00						404.00
	11/4	11/7	Cook Islands		231.00						231.00
	11/14	11/15	Western Samoa		75.00		1,975.00				2,050.00
Committee total					1,680.00		5,645.56		287.97		7,613.53

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MORRIS K. UDALL, Chairman, Mar. 31, 1987.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1987

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mickey Leland	1/9	1/9	London		147.00						147.00
	1/10	1/11	Zambia								300.00
	1/11	1/13	Botswana		500.00						500.00
Round trip transportation							5,200.34				5,200.34
	2/11	2/12	Italy		72.00						72.00
	2/12	2/16	Ethiopia		644.00						644.00
	2/17	2/20	Kenya		426.00						426.00
Round trip transportation							4,029				4,029.00
Jeffrey Clark	2/11	2/12	Italy		72.00						72.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1987—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	2/12	2/16	Ethiopia		644.00						644.00
	2/17	2/17	Kenya		426.00						426.00
Round trip transportation							4,029				4,029.00
Committee total					3,231.00		13,258.34				16,489.34

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MICKEY LELAND, Chairman, Mar. 18, 1987.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of the rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1103. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of the 73 rescission proposals, three new deferrals and three revised deferrals reported in the President's third special message for fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. (H. Doc. No. 100-60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1104. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of the 25 new deferrals, and one revised deferral reported in the President's fourth special message for fiscal year 1987; revised information with respect to seven rescission proposals made in the third special message, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 100-61); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1105. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics), transmitting the Secretary's annual report on adequacy of pay and allowances for members of the uniformed services, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 1008(a), 1009(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1106. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the Secretary's determination that it is in the public interest to use other than competitive procedures for housing units at the U.S. Naval Base, Subic Bay, the Philippines, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(c)(7); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1107. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Notice of Final Procedures for the Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1108. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the quarterly report on coal imports for the period October-December 1986, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7277(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1109. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notice of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to the Government of the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1110. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notice of a proposed license for the export of defense

articles or defense services sold commercially to the Government of Australia, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1111. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notice of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to the Government of Spain, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1112. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the second notification of proposed antiterrorism assistance for Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, pursuant to FAA, section 574(a)(1) (97 Stat. 972); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1113. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notification of terrorism related travel advisories for U.S. citizens traveling or residing in Peru, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656e; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1114. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting notification of a new Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Governmental Operations.

1115. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on the need for legislation to clarify Federal agencies' statutory authority to support the quadrennial Presidential inauguration; jointly, to the Committee on Government Operations and House Administration.

1116. A letter from the Vice President, Farm Credit Banks of Columbia; transmitting the farm credit retirement plan, Columbia District, report and audited financial statement as of August 31, 1985, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1117. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the National Sea Grant College Program Act as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1118. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the seventh annual report on collision avoidance systems, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1348 nt.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1119. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a lease prospectus which proposes leaseback of a municipally funded building in Oakland, CA, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1120. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of

proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the State Veterans' Home Grant Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1121. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting his report to the Congress on the applicable percentage increase for the Medicare prospective payment system for fiscal year 1988; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1122. A letter from the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the third quarterly commodity and country allocation table showing current programming plans for food assistance for fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1736b(a); jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

1123. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a copy of the final report on the effectiveness of including electric vehicles in the calculation of average fuel economy standards, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2512(c)(3); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

1124. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a "Report on the Situation in El Salvador" which encompasses four key areas: dialog between the government and the insurgents, civilian control of the military, judicial reform and agrarian reform, pursuant to Public Law 99-83, section 702(c) (99 Stat. 238); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

1125. A letter from the Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to increase premium revenue of the single-employer pension plan termination insurance program and to provide a more equitable distribution of single-employer pension plan premium costs; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk of printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

MR. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 148. A bill to designate certain public lands in the State of Michigan as wilderness, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 100-29, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

MR. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 3. A bill to enhance the competi-

tiveness of American industry, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 100-40, Pt. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 95. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990; (Rept. 100-41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 93, concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990 (Rept. 100-42). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1039. A bill to amend section 37 of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 relating to oil shale claims, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 100-43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 1846. A bill to make certain technical and conforming amendments in the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 100-44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LENT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. BOULTER):

H.R. 1960. A bill to provide for the energy security of the United States; jointly, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Interior and Insular Affairs, the Judiciary, Public Works and Transportation, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. ROVKEMA):

H.R. 1961. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the efficiency and adequacy of the current retirement income system (consisting of employer and individual retirement plans) in carrying out its supplemental role to Social Security in providing benefits upon death, disability, and retirement by simplifying and clarifying applicable statutory requirements relating to simplified employee pensions, and by providing for portable pension plans which will expand pension coverage, provide for a form of pension portability, and preserve pension asset accumulations for payment in retirement income form, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means.

H.R. 1962. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve the efficiency and adequacy of the current retirement income system (consist-

ing of employer and individual retirement plans) in carrying out its supplemental role to Social Security in providing benefits upon death, disability, and retirement by simplifying and clarifying applicable statutory requirements relating to simplified employee pensions, and by providing for portable pension plans which will expand pension coverage, provide for a form of pension portability, and preserve pension asset accumulations for payment in retirement income form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. MARLENEE):

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to permit States to set aside in a special trust fund up to 10 per centum of the annual State funds from the abandoned mine land reclamation fund for expenditure in the future for purposes of abandoned mine reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself and Mr. RITTER):

H.R. 1964. A bill to amend the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 to increase the use of the metric system in Government programs; to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 1965. A bill to freeze all spending in the budget of the U.S. Government at fiscal year 1987 levels and to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to exclude social security trust funds from the definition of deficit; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Rules.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 1966. A bill to provide that positions held by civilian technicians of the National Guard be made part of the competitive service; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, and Armed Services.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to encourage the free flow of information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK (by request):

H.R. 1968. A bill to amend the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 to require that a competitive examination process be used for the selection of members of boards of contract appeals of Federal Government agencies; and to provide that the members of such boards shall be treated in the same manner as administrative law judges of the Federal Government for certain administrative purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 1969. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study of the need for additional transportation facilities and services between northern New Jersey and New York City, NY; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.R. 1970. A bill to conserve the marine and coastal resources of the Gulf of Mexico; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BAL-

LENGER, Mr. DYSON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ATKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FISH, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GREGG, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. RIDGE):

H.R. 1971. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit certain individuals with physical or mental impairments to continue medicare coverage at their own expense; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. CLINGER):

H.R. 1972. A bill to amend the International Air Transportation Fair Competitive Practices Act of 1974; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. STANGELAND (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. MARLENEE):

H.R. 1973. A bill to stimulate employment through the creation of rural enterprise zones designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 1974. A bill to deny funds for projects using products or services of foreign countries that deny fair market opportunities; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.R. 1975. A bill to protect caves resources on Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H.R. 1976. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore child's insurance benefits for postsecondary school students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1977. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore the pre-1981 provisions for determining the order of payment of lump-sum death benefits, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1978. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore from age 16 to age 18 the age of a child at which certain benefits under such title are terminated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 1979. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning October 4, 1987, as "National School Yearbook Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYES of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect cultural and linguistic rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARMEY (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. WALKER):

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should renegotiate the 1969 and 1972 agreements concerning a new Soviet Embassy in Washington, DC, and a new United States Embassy in Moscow; and that the new agreement should require the Soviets to move their partially completed new embassy from its current Mount Alto site to another suitable site not more than 150 feet above mean sea level; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BYRON (for herself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. FAWELL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DYMAALLY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DANIEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. GEJENSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan):

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution to encourage State and local governments and local educational agencies to provide high quality daily physical education programs for all children in kindergarten through grade 12; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. BROWN of Colorado):

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of California):

H. Res. 140. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should establish a Commission on AIDS; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

19. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to the real estate appraisal profession; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

20. Also, memorial of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to certain property in Fairfax County, VA; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

21. Also, memorial of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to the insurance industry's exemption from Federal antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

22. Also, memorial of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative

to the use of TBT; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

23. Also, memorial of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to the treatment of certain aliens by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

24. Also, memorial of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to maximum highway speed limits, enactment of a Federal aid highway bill; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

25. Also, memorial of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to the insurance industry; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

26. Also, memorial of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to care for multiple trauma victims; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SHAW introduced a bill (H.R. 1980) for the relief of Michael Christopher Kinsella, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 67: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 90: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 162: Mr. DICKS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 182: Mr. MICA, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 280: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 283: Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 379: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 390: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BONKER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 457: Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. OKAR, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 462: Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GRANT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. FASCELL.

H.R. 543: Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HUCKABY, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 573: Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 603: Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 612: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 618: Mr. COELHO, Mr. YATES, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, and Mr. CARR.

H.R. 726: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 727: Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 755: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 778: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 779: Mr. WOLPE and Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN.

H.R. 781: Mr. PICKLE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FROST, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 950: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. YATES, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MOODY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. FISH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 954: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1003: Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SABO, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 1049: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1119: Mr. BATES.

H.R. 1120: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1122: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. SABO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WOLPE, and Ms. OKAR.

H.R. 1196: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1202: Mr. SUNIA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 1280: Mr. HOYER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SABO, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FROST, Mr. FISH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 1281: Mr. HOYER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SABO, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FROST, Mr. FISH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 1293: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 1346: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 1395: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1398: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1413: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1488: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 1495: Mr. BEILINSON, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1509: Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1524: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1546: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1559: Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 1566: Mr. OLIN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DAUB, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RAY, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. GREEN.

H.R. 1568: Mr. MARTIN of New York.

H.R. 1601: Mr. ROSE and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1621: Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 1644: Mr. STANGELAND.

H.R. 1678: Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FRANK, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1770: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1829: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1830: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1832: Mr. PETRI, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1914: Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 1935: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. DEFazio.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. SAXTON.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.J. Res. 150: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 158: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WHITTAKER, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.J. Res. 160: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BATES, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CARR, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GEJENSON, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KONNYU, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MACK, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr.

SISISKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 197: Mr. STUMP, Mr. GREGG, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. DARDEN.

H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. STUMP.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. HORTON and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H. Res. 19: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. LUNGREN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H. CON. RES. 93 OR 95

By Mr. DANNEMEYER:

(Amendment in the nature of a substitute.)

—Strike everything after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988 is hereby established and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1989 and 1990 are hereby set forth:

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988: \$677,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$722,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$792,900,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988: \$18,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$24,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$28,500,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988: \$883,159,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$904,840,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$940,359,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total new budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988: \$811,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$822,882,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$855,870,000,000.

(4)(A) The amounts of the deficits in the budget which are appropriate in the light of economic conditions and all other relevant factors are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988: \$133,834,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$100,182,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$62,970,000,000.

(B) For purposes of the maximum deficit amount mandated by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 only, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority, budget outlays, Federal revenues, and deficits, including receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Trust Fund, are as follows:

New budget authority:

Fiscal year 1988: \$1,135,210,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$1,181,010,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,245,560,000,000.

Outlays:

Fiscal year 1988: \$1,027,380,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$1,053,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,102,720,000,000.

Revenues:

Fiscal year 1988: \$929,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$986,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,079,500,000,000.

Deficit:

Fiscal year 1988: \$107,980,00,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$67,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$23,220,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988: \$2,565,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1989: \$2,776,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1990: \$2,966,300,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1987, October 1, 1988, and October 1, 1989, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$29,650,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$129,360,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$27,780,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$129,760,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$26,910,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$130,430,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations and new loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1988 through 1989 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$304,280,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$291,910,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$319,520,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$306,690,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$335,860,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$322,220,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,260,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,790,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$7,120,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$10,250,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

- (A) New budget authority, \$15,870,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$14,340,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$6,640,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$10,250,000,000.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal Year 1990:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,480,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$14,890,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$6,740,000,000.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$10,250,000,000.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1988:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,570,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$10,680,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,050,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,470,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,570,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,890,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal Year 1988:

- (A) New budget authority, \$3,170,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,030,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,580,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

- (A) New budget authority, \$3,540,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,670,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,640,000,000.

- (D) New Primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal Year 1990:

- (A) New budget authority, \$3,420,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,380,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,650,000,000.

- (D) New Primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1988:

- (A) New budget authority, \$15,550,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$14,950,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$30,000,000.

- (D) New Primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,360,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$16,220,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$20,000,000.

- (D) New Primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,990,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$17,610,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$20,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1988:

- (A) New budget authority, \$28,720,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,820,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,100,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,000,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,990,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,090,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$14,300,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,000,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,400,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,200,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,100,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1988:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,870,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,120,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,920,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$75,210,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,840,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,820,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$73,900,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal Year 1990:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,030,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,280,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,860,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$76,280,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal Year 1988:

- (A) New Budget authority, \$28,690,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,580,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$150,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal Year 1989:

- (A) New Budget authority, \$29,280,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,980,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$150,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New Secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal Year 1990:

- (A) New Budget authority, \$30,330,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,610,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$150,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal Year 1988:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,970,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,730,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$480,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,090,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,330,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$430,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,230,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,340,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$430,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$40,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1988:

- (A) New budget authority, \$32,940,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,910,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$9,400,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

- (A) New budget authority, \$34,660,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,460,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,810,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$10,710,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

- (A) New budget authority, \$35,880,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$34,900,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,840,000,000.

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$11,860,000,000.

- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1988:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,620,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$42,250,000,000.

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$30,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,320,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,870,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$40,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,370,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,540,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$40,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(12) Medical Insurance (570):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$93,380,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$79,650,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$103,170,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$88,440,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$114,230,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$99,570,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$165,980,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$130,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$173,880,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$137,370,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$180,390,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$142,880,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,740,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,740,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,305,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,305,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,376,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,376,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,380,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$830,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$27,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,610,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$920,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$27,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,430,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,050,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$970,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$24,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,940,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,110,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,050,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,220,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,220,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,780,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,330,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,780,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,610,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,070,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,870,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,860,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,910,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,970,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,970,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(19) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, \$121,410,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$121,410,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New budget authority, \$99,650,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$99,650,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$90,420,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$90,420,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(20) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New Budget authority, -\$2,950,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$2,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New Budget authority, -\$180,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$30,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New Budget authority, \$3,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,010,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New Budget authority, \$44,960,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,960,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1989:

(A) New Budget authority, \$45,210,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,210,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New Budget authority, \$46,760,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,760,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2. (a) Not later than June 5, 1987, the committees named in subsections (b) through (cc) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

(b) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in law within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$2,447,000,000 and outlays by \$2,435,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$4,326,000,000 and outlays by \$4,346,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$4,424,000,000 and outlays by \$4,494,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(c) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: de-

crease budget authority by \$4,170,000,000 and outlays by \$5,009,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$5,900,000,000 and outlays by \$6,568,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$7,460,000,000 and outlays by \$8,265,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(d) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in law within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$4,031,000,000 and outlays by \$1,836,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$4,605,000,000 and outlays by \$2,675,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$4,915,000,000 and outlays by \$3,375,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(e) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$1,712,000,000 and outlays by \$1,085,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$1,799,000,000 and outlays by \$2,224,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$1,817,000,000 and outlays by \$2,422,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(f) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$4,631,000,000 and outlays by \$3,444,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$5,390,000,000 and outlays by \$5,098,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$5,951,000,000 and outlays by \$5,941,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(g) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$2,246,000,000 and outlays by \$2,977,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$7,378,000,000 and outlays by \$2,014,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and de-

crease budget authority by \$3,532,000,000 and outlays by \$1,624,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(h) The House Committee on Government Operations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$8,461,000,000 and outlays by \$8,445,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$5,697,000,000 and outlays by \$5,673,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$3,225,000,000 and outlays by \$3,205,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(i) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$175,000,000 and outlays by \$172,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$195,000,000 and outlays by \$195,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$205,000,000 and outlays by \$205,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(j) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$420,000,000 and outlays by \$420,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$440,000,000 and outlays by \$440,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$460,000,000 and outlays by \$460,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(k) The House Committee in Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$806,000,000 and outlays by \$1,016,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$963,000,000 and outlays by \$1,223,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$970,000,000 and outlays by \$1,240,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(l) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section

(y) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide

pending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$3,910,000,000 and outlays by \$3,253,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$4,155,000,000 and outlays by \$4,820,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$4,365,000,000 and outlays by \$5,310,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(z) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$81,000,000 and outlays by \$3,566,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$85,000,000 and outlays by \$4,205,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$85,000,000 and outlays by \$4,875,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(aa) The Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$5,000,000 and outlays by \$18,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$60,000,000 and outlays by \$55,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$90,000,000 and outlays by \$85,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(bb) The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$420,000,000 and outlays by \$420,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$440,000,000 and outlays by \$440,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$460,000,000 and outlays by \$460,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

(cc) The Senate Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority, as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays; (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays; or

(3) any combination thereof, as follows: decrease budget authority by \$83,000,000 and outlays by \$83,000,000 in fiscal year 1988; decrease budget authority by \$125,000,000 and outlays by \$125,000,000 in fiscal year 1989; and decrease budget authority by \$122,000,000 and outlays by \$122,000,000 in fiscal year 1990.

TAX AMNESTY

Sec. 3. (a) The Congress shall report legislation establishing a Federal tax amnesty program, that—

(1) authorizes a one-time amnesty from criminal and civil tax penalties for taxpayers who notify the Internal Revenue Service of previous underpayments of Federal tax and pay such underpayments in full;

(2) shall be in effect for a three month period beginning July 1, 1988;

(3) applies to all payments relating to tax years ending on or before December 31, 1986.

(b) Revenues collected pursuant to this program shall be used solely for the purpose of reducing the Federal deficit.

GOLD BONDS

Sec. 4. (a) The Congress shall report legislation authorizing the issuance of Treasury obligations redeemable in gold, that—

(1) are known as Eagle bonds;

(2) have an annual investment yield not exceeding 1.75%;

(3) have an initial maturity of forty years, and may not be issued for less than twenty-five years;

(4) have principal and interest redeemable at maturity in gold;

(5) are intended to replace high-interest, short-term debt.

(b) The issuance of gold bonds is intended to achieve—

(1) a permanent reduction in the rate of interest on the public debt;

(2) a permanent reduction of the rate of interest on the private debt;

(3) a significant reduction of the Federal budget deficit;

(4) the elimination of the U.S. trade deficit.

FEDERAL DEBT COLLECTION REFORM

Sec. 5. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal government is a major lender and allocator of capital through direct loan and loan guarantee programs. By the end of 1986, the Federal government was directly and indirectly involved in \$1.2 trillion in lending activity;

(2) the Federal Financing Bank serves in a major capacity to coordinate the financing of these programs;

(3) despite improvements in funding achieved by the Federal Financing Bank, serious shortcomings still exist in allocating and managing Federal credit programs, and current Federal credit program controls provide little incentive for sound management practices and timely debt collection;

(4) since 1981, delinquent debt owed the Federal government has increased from \$29.8 billion to \$68.3 billion, or 129 percent, and needed reforms in credit management and debt collection deserve immediate consideration by Congress and the Administration.

(b) It is therefore the sense of Congress that the appropriate committees of the Congress should review programs to improve the processes of granting credit assistance and timely collection of delinquent debt, including such proposals as—

(1) the appointment of a "debt czar" who would be ultimately responsible for credit

management and debt collection throughout the Federal government;

(2) mandating all Federal agencies to establish specific management systems to ensure proper and timely administration of credit assistance and debt collection;

(3) require the use of private collection agencies to collect delinquent accounts and private credit bureaus to assist in maintaining accurate records of recipients of Federal credit assistance;

(4) providing the Department of Justice and other Federal agencies with additional means to enhance debt collection through appropriate litigation efforts;

(5) enacting statutes that prohibit delinquent debtors from continuing to receive additional Federal credit assistance;

(6) providing budgetary incentives for Federal agencies to improve debt collection; and

(7) facilitating the sharing of debt-related information among Federal agencies to ensure proper credit management and timely debt collection.

By Mr. LATTA:

—Designate the preceding text and sections as Title I, and sections 101-103, respectively, and add the following new titles:

TITLE II—BUDGET PROCESS REFORM AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. PROHIBITION AGAINST EXTRANEOUS MATTERS IN RECONCILIATION MEASURES.

In Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, add the following new clause:

"(8. (a) No provision shall be reported in the House in any reconciliation bill pursuant to the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget, or be in order as an amendment thereto in the House or Committee of the Whole, which is not related to achieving the purposes of the directives to House committees contained in such concurrent resolution.

"(b) Nothing in this clause shall be construed to prevent the consideration of any provision in a reconciliation bill, or any amendment thereto, which achieves savings greater than those directed of a committee and which conforms to paragraph (c) of this clause, or to prevent the consideration of motions to strike made in order by the Committee on Rules to achieve the purposes of the directives.

"(c) For the purposes of this clause, a provision shall be considered related to achieving the purposes of directives contained in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget if it is estimated by the House Committee on the Budget, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office, to effectuate or implement a reduction in budget authority or in new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act, or to raise revenues, or both, and, in the case of an amendment, if it is within (in whole or in part) the jurisdiction of any committee instructed in the concurrent resolution.

"(d) The point of order provided for by this clause shall not apply to Senate amendments or to conference reports.

"(e) For the purposes of this clause, all points of order shall be considered as having been reserved against a reconciliation bill at the time it was reported."

SEC. 202. ENFORCEMENT OF COMMITTEE OUTLAY SUBALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.

In section 302(f)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 99-344), the final clause is amended to read as follows:

"would cause the appropriate allocation made pursuant to subsection (b) for such fiscal year of new discretionary budget authority, new entitlement authority, new credit authority, or budget outlays to be exceeded."

SEC. 203. SPENDING CEILING IN HOUSE: REPEAL OF EXCEPTION AND STRENGTHENING OF ENFORCEMENT.

Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) is amended by striking subsection (b) in its present form and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any rule, resolution, or motion which directly or indirectly waives or suspends of the provisions of subsection (a) except by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the House, duly chosen and sworn."

SEC. 204. REQUIRED REPORTING OF ALL APPROPRIATIONS BILLS BEFORE ANY CAN BE CONSIDERED.

Section 307 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) is amended by inserting at the beginning thereof the subsection designation "(a)", and by adding the following new subsection:

"(b) It shall not be in order in either the House or the Senate to consider any regular appropriation bill for a fiscal year until the Committee on Appropriations of that House has reported to its House all of the regular appropriations bills for such fiscal year."

SEC. 205. SHORT-TERM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FORMULA.

House Rule XXI, clause 2, is amended by inserting after subparagraph (d) the following new subparagraph:

"(e) It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for a period of thirty-days or less (hereinafter referred to as a "short-term continuing appropriations measure") unless such measure only provides appropriations in the lesser amount and under the more restrictive authority of the pertinent appropriations measure which follows: (1) as reported by the House; (2) as passed by the House; (2) as passed by the Senate; (3) as agreed to by a committee of conference; or, (4) as enacted for the preceding fiscal year."

SEC. 206. LIMITATIONS ON LONG-TERM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) In House Rule XXI, clause 2 is amended by striking the second sentence of paragraph (c) and paragraph (d) in its entirety, and by inserting the following new paragraph (d):

"(d)(1) For the purpose of House Rules, a 'general appropriation bill' shall include not only regular and multi-purpose supplemental appropriation measures, but shall also include any bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Federal Government in a fiscal year for a period in excess of thirty-days (elsewhere referred to as a "long-term continuing appropriations measure"), and any such measure shall include the full text of the language proposed to be enacted (as opposed to mere references to other bills which have been reported or passed by either House, or agreed to by a committee of conference).

"(2) The provisions of clause 2(1)(3)(B) of rule XI shall apply to any 'general appropriation bill' as defined in subparagraph (1).

"(3) For the purposes of this clause, all points of order shall be considered as having been reserved against any general appropriation bill at the time it was reported."

(b) In House Rule XXI, clause 3 is amended by striking the period at the end thereof

a comma, and adding the following: "and shall contain a list of all appropriations contained in the bill for any expenditure not previously authorized by law."

(c) In House Rule XI, clause 2(1)(3)(B) is amended by striking "(other than continuing appropriations)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than continuing appropriations, except long-term continuing appropriations measures as defined in clause 2(d) of Rule XXI)".

(d) In House Rule XI, clause 4(b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "It shall not be in order, except by a vote of not less than three-fifths of the Members of the House duly chosen and sworn, to consider any rule or order from the Committee on Rules which waives the provisions of clause 2(e) of Rule XXI against the consideration of any short-term continuing appropriations measure as defined therein; or which waives the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XXI against, or denies amendment to, any provision of a long-term continuing appropriations measure as defined therein if said provision has not been previously considered and agreed to by the House."

SEC. 207. SPECIAL RESCISSION AUTHORITY OVER LONG-TERM CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS MEASURES.

The Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SPECIAL RESCISSION AUTHORITY"

"SEC. 1018. (a) TRANSMITTAL OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.

Whenever there is enacted a long-term continuing appropriations measure (effective for a period in excess of 30-days) providing sums for the operations of the several departments, agencies, corporations and other organizational units of the Government which are normally provided for under two or more regular appropriations bills, the President may transmit to Congress, within three calendar days after the enactment of such measure, one or more special messages proposing to rescind all or part of any budget authority provided for in such measure: *Provided* That the total amount proposed to be rescinded in all such special messages shall not exceed ten percentum of the projected deficit for such fiscal year as contained in the most recent joint report of the Directors of the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office submitted pursuant to section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177). Such report shall conform to the provisions of section 1012(a) to the extent applicable.

"(b) REQUIREMENT TO MAKE AVAILABLE FOR OBLIGATION.—Any amount of budget authority proposed to be rescinded by a special message transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made available for obligation if Congress enacts a joint resolution disapproving the rescission of such amount within 20 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the President's message is received (not counting those days on which the joint resolution is pending the President's approval or disapproval or those days on which a veto message of the President is pending consideration by the Congress).

"(c) EFFECT OF ADJOURNMENT ON RESCISSION.—If the Congress adjourns sine die prior to the expiration of the 20 calendar day period referred to in subsection (b) (or pending the President's decision to approve or disapprove a joint resolution; or pending the disposition by the Congress of a presidential veto message relating to any such

joint resolution), the budget authority proposed to be rescinded shall continue to be withheld from obligation until the succeeding session of Congress convenes. On the first day of such succeeding session of Congress, the President may resubmit a rescission message for any such proposed rescission which was not subject to the full congressional review process in the preceding session, and the period for congressional consideration shall begin de novo, subject to the provisions of this section.

"(d) PROCEDURES IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE.—Joint resolutions disapproving proposed rescission shall be introduced, referred and considered in accordance with the provisions applicable to "rescission bills" under section 1017 except that—

"(1) the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to more than one identical joint resolution of disapproval with respect to the same rescission message, and shall not apply to joint resolutions introduced within three calendar days of continuous session of Congress after receipt of such message;

"(2) if any such joint resolution is not reported from committee within 10 calendar days of continuous session of Congress after receipt of the rescission message, the committee shall be deemed to be discharged from its further consideration, and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of that House;

"(3) a vote on final passage of such joint resolution shall occur not later than the 10th calendar days of continuous session after receipt of the rescission message."

SEC. 208. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The provisions of this title (insofar as applicable), are enacted by the Congress—

(a) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith.

(b) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 209. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this title having the status of rules of the House or Senate shall take effect upon the final adoption by that House of this concurrent resolution. Those provisions not having the status of House or Senate rules shall take effect upon the enactment of the joint resolution containing such provisions as provided for in section 210.

SEC. 210. SPECIAL PROCEDURES.

Any provisions of Title II or Title III (or any compromise thereon) which are contained in the concurrent resolution on the budget as finally agreed to, shall be included by the enrolling clerk of the House in the joint resolution prepared pursuant to House Rule XLIX.

TITLE III—RESTORATION OF AUTOMATIC SEQUESTRATION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Deficit Reduction Commission Act of 1987".

Subtitle A—Commission on Deficit Reduction

SEC. 311. COMMISSION ON DEFICIT REDUCTION.

The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART F—COMMISSION ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

"SEC. 281. ESTABLISHMENT.

"There is established the Commission on Deficit Reduction (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Commission').

"SEC. 282. PURPOSE OF COMMISSION.

"The Commission shall—
 "(1) review and consider the reports issued by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 251;

"(2) issue reports to the President and Congress estimating the budget base levels of total revenues and total budget outlays for each fiscal year;

"(3) state whether there is a deficit for each fiscal year in excess of the permissible maximum deficit amount;

"(4) specify the amounts by which the deficit must be reduced to eliminate such excess deficit, if any, for each fiscal year; and

"(5) perform such other responsibilities as are required of the Commission under section 251 of this Act.

"SEC. 283. MEMBERSHIP.

"(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of six members, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, not more than three of whom shall be affiliated with the same political party, as follows:

"(1) Two individuals, not affiliated with the same political party, for terms ending on July 31, 1989, and successors whose terms shall end on September 30, 1991.

"(2) Two individuals, not affiliated with the same political party, after the consideration by the President of a list of prospective nominees submitted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (in consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives), for terms ending September 30, 1991.

"(3) Two individuals, not affiliated with the same political party, after the consideration by the President of a list of prospective nominees submitted by the President pro tempore of the Senate (in consultation with the minority leader of the Senate), for terms ending September 30, 1991.

Appointments may be made under this subsection without regard to section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—Individuals appointed by the President shall not be officers or employees of any government at the time of their appointment and shall be individuals who are specially qualified to serve on the Commission by virtue of their education, training, or experience.

"(c) VACANCIES.—(1) A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(2) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which that member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. Except as provided by paragraph (3), a member may serve after the expiration of that member's term until a successor has taken office.

"(3) If any member of the Commission becomes an officer or employee of any other department or agency of any government, that member may continue as a member of the Commission for not longer than the 30-day period beginning on the date such member becomes such an officer or employee.

"(d) BASIC PAY.—Members of the Commission may each be entitled to receive the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315) for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

"(e) QUORUM.—Four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may hold hearings.

"(f) CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

"(g) MEETING.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members.

"SEC. 284. DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF COMMISSION.

"(a) DIRECTOR.—The Commission shall, without regard to section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code, have a Director who shall be appointed by the Commission and who may be paid at a rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule.

"(b) STAFF.—With the approval of the Commission, the Director may appoint and fix the pay of such additional personnel as the Director considers appropriate.

"(c) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The Director and staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

"(d) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act.

"SEC. 285. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

"(a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out its duties under this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate.

"(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out its duties under this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

"SEC. 286. TERMINATION.

"The Commission shall cease to exist on September 30, 1991.

"SEC. 287. EFFECTIVE DATE.

"This part of this title shall take effect on January 1, 1987."

SEC. 312. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents set forth in subsection (b) of section 200 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"PART F—COMMISSION ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

"Sec. 281. Establishment.

"Sec. 282. Purpose of Commission.

"Sec. 283. Membership.

"Sec. 284. Director and staff of Commission.

"Sec. 285. Powers of Commission.

"Sec. 286. Termination.

"Sec. 287. Effective date."

Subtitle B—Substitution of Commission on Deficit Reduction for Comptroller General in the Deficit Reduction Process

SEC. 321. REPORTING OF EXCESS DEFICITS.

(a) INITIAL ESTIMATES, DETERMINATIONS, AND REPORT BY OMB AND CBO.—Subsection (a)(2) of section 251 of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") is amended by striking out "shall report to the Comptroller General" and by inserting in lieu thereof "shall report to the Commission on Deficit Reduction (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Commission')".

(b) REPORT TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS BY COMMISSION.—Subsection (b) of section 251 of part C of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "COMPTROLLER GENERAL" in its side heading and by inserting in lieu thereof "COMMISSION"; and

(2) by striking out "Comptroller General" and by inserting in lieu thereof "Commission" each place it appears therein.

(c) REVISED ESTIMATES, DETERMINATIONS, AND REPORTS.—Subsection (c) of section 251 of part C of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Comptroller General" each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and by inserting in lieu thereof "Commission"; and

(2) by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) REPORT TO COMMISSION BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

"(A) Two calendar days after the issuance of any report by the Directors under section 251(a)(2) or the issuance of any revised report under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Commission commenting on the contents of such report or revised report.

"(B) On the same day the Directors submit to the Commission their report under section 251(a)(2) or their revised report under paragraph (1) of this subsection, they shall submit such report or revised report to the Comptroller General."

(d) DATES FOR SUBMISSION OF REPORTS AND ISSUANCE OF ORDERS.—Subsection (e) of section 251 of part C of the Act is amended by inserting "Commission," before "Comptroller General".

(e) PRINTING OF REPORTS.—Subsection (f) of section 251 of part C of the Act is amended by striking out "Comptroller General" and by inserting in lieu thereof "Commission".

SEC. 322. PRESIDENTIAL ORDER.

(a) ISSUANCE OF INITIAL ORDER.—Subsection (a) of section 252 of part C of the Act is amended in paragraph (1) by striking out "Comptroller General" each place it appears and by inserting in lieu thereof "Commission"; and

(b) ISSUANCE OF FINAL ORDER.—Subsection (b) of section 252 of part C of the Act is amended by striking out "Comptroller General" each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and by inserting in lieu thereof "Commission".

SEC. 323. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.

Subsection (b)(1)(A) of section 254 of part C of the Act is amended by striking out

"Comptroller General" and by inserting in lieu thereof "Commission".

SEC. 324. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) **ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR THE JOINT REPORTS OF THE DIRECTORS.**—Subsection (f) of section 274 of part E of the Act is repealed.

(b) **ECONOMIC DATA, ASSUMPTIONS, AND METHODOLOGIES.**—Subsections (g) and (h) of section 274 of part E of the Act are redesignated as subsections (f) and (g) respectively, and such subsection (g) (as redesignated) is amended by striking out "Comptroller Gen-

eral" both times it appears therein and by inserting in lieu thereof "Commission".

SEC. 325. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall become effective on the date of enactment of this title.